

Vol. XXXVIII

APRIL, 1961

No. 2

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: £1 *per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rt. Rev. A. J. McRae, Chancery Office, 7 Paterson Street, Wellington C.4, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Dulwich, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart — Rev. R. Donohoe, Kingston, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, R.I., V.F., Terang, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. J. Cass, Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Bunbury — Rt. Rev. C. Cunningham, V.G., Albany, W.A.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. G. Kane, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. T. Fahey, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Leonora, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore — Rt. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., V.F., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Merewether Beach, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Pirie — Very Rev. W. Kain, R.I., V.F., Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton — Rt. Rev. D. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Very Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes — Rt. Rev. J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:

Rt. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." *St. Augustine.*

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

- Right Rev. Mgr. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 91
- Papal Address to Roman Clergy (November 24, 1960)—
Addition to the Divine Praises.

THE MORAL ISSUES IN HORMONAL CONTROL OF FERTILITY.

Rev. Nicholas Crotty, C.P. 102

GRACE AND PERSON. Rev. E. J. Cuskelly, M.S.C. 114

SPONSORS AT CONFIRMATION. Rev. J. P. Kenny, S.J. 123

MORAL THEOLOGY. Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 135

Question on Bination—Car Insurance—Oral Contraceptives
and Family Limitation—Missa pro populo.

CANON LAW. Right Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L. 149

The promise concerning the Catholic education of the
children of mixed marriages.

LITURGY. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 155

The New Rubrics and Lauds.

HOMILETICS. Rev. Alexius Carroll, D.D., L.S.S. 162

The Words upon the Cross.

NOTES. 167

Anna, The Mother of Samuel, and her Canticle (Rt. Rev.
Mgr. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)

BOOK REVIEWS. 172

Mary Ward (Mother M. Oliver); Patrology, Vol. III
(Quasten); Parents' Role in Vocations (Poage and Treacy);
Living the Mass (Desplanques); The Spirit of Catholicism
(Adam); The Holy Spirit and the Art of Living (O'Driscoll);
Pray Like This (Sheil); The Nativity (St. Bernard. *Trans.*
Dargan); The Complete Prayers of His Holiness Pius XII
(*Trans.* Guinan).

SHORT NOTICES. 122, 134

Nihil Obstat:

**THOMAS HARRINGTON
CENSOR DEPUTATUS.**

Imprimatur:

**✠ N. T. CARD. GILROY,
ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.**

1a die Aprilis, 1961

Official Documents

THE HOLY FATHER'S ADDRESS

to the Clergy of Rome, when the laws of the first Roman Synod had become obligatory (November 24, 1960).

Beloved Sons . . . From the day which proclaimed the Roman Synod duly promulgated, that is, from the first of November, the same Roman Synod has the force of diocesan law. According to the words of the Apostolic Constitution, "*Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum*," every priest of the Roman clergy now knows how he must regulate himself in regard to priestly duties. The pages of the Synod, diligently read and assimilated, say to him every day: "*Hoc fac et vives*."

Therefore, beloved sons, at the time when your happy dispositions are intent on putting the ordinances of the Synod into daily practice, We have considered it opportune and agreeable to you that We should add some words to those which We spoke to you in familiar conversation during the days of the Synod, last January. This address of Ours will be a new encouragement to you, a new incentive for all to do Us honour before God, before Holy Church and before men.

The Sacred Volume of the Roman Synod is in circulation already throughout the world, welcomed and appreciated by venerable Pastors, who have communicated to Us orally and in writing the sense of their pleasure at its contents. We are having it translated into Italian and into other languages for the sake of the laity, who will find in it a clear and luminous vision of the great principles which make the solidity of that wise and divine structure, which is the Church of Jesus, still militant here on earth, but always anchored in the security of the triumphs of that life which belongs to the ages of eternity.

DILIGENT READING OF THE SYNOD

This is the first thing we have to say to you. Take to your hearts at once, as a beloved task, Our invitation to read the Synod assiduously. Day by day, such reading will open before you hidden beauties of thought and wisdom. Make it a familiar practice to re-read and relish those pages. Do so in preference to following certain practices of piety which are not at all so

valuable. We are saying this to you with open candour, as the occasion offers itself. Even the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of Jesus and our dear Mother, will not be offended, if We say openly that there are certain practices and devotions even in the honouring of the Madonna and some saints that have the fault of excessiveness and impoverish the religious life of our good people. You will understand what We mean. It is the duty of a priest to be on his guard and to teach the same caution to the people. There are certain exclusive practices of piety which satisfy sentiment, but of themselves alone do not have really solid value. They fall short of what the full acquittal of religious obligation demands and do not correspond with the strong and simple legislation of the first three commandments of the Decalogue. These commandments are heavy with meaning and are correspondingly serious in the obligations they impose.

The reading of the New Code of diocesan life is supported by the Old and the New Testaments, by the Prophets and the Evangelists. Ezechiel, for instance, in the second chapter of his prophetic poem, sees the vision of a scroll, held out by a mysterious hand, written within and without, containing lamentations, canticles and woes. This precious book the Prophet was invited to read and devour, and he similarly invites us to read and devour. Interiorly it filled him with the fat and the richness of life; it filled his mouth with sweetness as of honey.

Likewise, St. John and the other Evangelists—Biblical Concordances will abundantly show it—render continual homage to the reading of those books which contain the voice of God speaking to our heart—books which are a lamp to our feet—*vox Domini: divina lex: liber vitæ*.

Have you reflected, dear sons, on the teaching of that Psalm (118) which begins with the words: *Beati immaculati in via* or in the new translation: *Beati quorum immaculata est via*. Close to its end it complains: *Principes persequuntur me sine causa*, and it finishes with those very touching words: *Vivat anima mea et laudet te: et decreta tua adiuvent me: Oberro ut ovis quæ perii, quære servum tuum, quia mandata tua non sum oblitus*. You will find that the invitations and recommendations of this psalm of the dominical hours may be regarded as a buttress to the synodal decrees.

It would be delightful to offer you some samples of that scriptural buttressing, but you can find them for yourselves.

Remembering days when St. Ambrose's *Expositio in Psalmum CXVIII* was a companion of youth, We recommend those 342 pages of the fifteenth volume of Migne (P.L.) in which the 22 sermons of that Exposition offer abundant pasture for pious souls.

Let this little word, by way of hint, suffice. We ask you rather to give willing ear to three thoughts which We wish to transmit and recommend to your devout attention.

SPLENDOUR OF THE PRIEST'S MISSION

Our first thought is drawn from the 14th Psalm of David: *Domine, quis commorabitur in tabernaculo tuo, quis habitabit in monte sancto tuo?* This reference to the perfection characterizing our priestly mission is the first light of the Synod.

First of all: *ambulare sine macula*. This means a blameless life, personal conduct that is worthy of the admiration of the angels of the Lord, of the edification of the faithful, of the respect of the unbelievers round about us. Every other praise of personal qualities, whether they be talent or savoir-faire, or external success, is only a fatuous and deceptive make-believe. The priest is seen especially at the altar: in his care and respect for liturgical laws, in his attention instinct with promptness and simplicity, without sophistic pretences, which only bemean and displease. The priest, who is the man of the altar, should remain in continual communication of thought, feeling and word with Jesus; he should be in his exterior a reflection of his good priestly conscience, living in perfect, familiar confidence with his confessor. This will secure the good ascetic direction and effective discipline of his life.

The altar, the altar, beloved sons, is the gravitation centre of eyes and heart. It proclaims how our life is shaped; from the altar radiate all the chief activities of a priest: confessions, direction of souls, catechetical instruction, the care of the sick, prompt, prudent, patient contact with the faithful of all ages and conditions, in circumstances of doubt, of sorrow, of public calamities, of misery.

The Psalm follows on with: *facere institiam et cogitare recta in corde suo*. The habit of thinking ill of everything and everybody is a nuisance to oneself and to everyone round about. Eyes should be modest in every respect, but open and perceptive to realities—our own and our neighbours! Our habitual disposition

should be that *Nosce teipsum* which teaches sympathy towards others. The good soul knows how to sweeten everything, to turn everything to good, to draw motives of fervour from the examples of neighbours.

The government of the tongue is a most important matter: *non calumniare: non facere malum proximo suo: non opprobrium inferre vicino suo*. This would be a horrid vice in the exercise of sacerdotal life.

This discipline of self in the domain of charity does not dispense us from judging truly, from having right contempt for the moral deviations of the world. We must be on our guard, we must watch against deceit, we must be very careful not to admit any compromises with the world, in view of money or advantage or material interests. Such conduct would be particularly bad and damnable, if it tended or was directed to the hurt of innocent persons.

Here we are on the bases of the natural law. Woe to the priest who, in most shameful pretence, would dare to cover himself with false tinsel and pretexts of canon law, or customs, which are really inexistent or simple forgeries of a perverted mind.

Happy the priest who experiences this dwelling in the pavilion of the Lord, who knows what it is to keep himself from all the debasements of the world by living with God *in monte sancto suo*.

Psalms 14 lifts us above the seductions and enchantments of the present life, and it finds felicitous prolongation in Psalms 15 and 16, *Conserva me Deus, quoniam confugio ad Te—Audi, Domine, iustam causam, attende clamorem meum*.

O, how serene is a sacerdotal life upheld with such song! Psalm 16 may be used to fix the affection of our hearts on the magnificent volume of the Roman Synod, for it puts on our lips the words: *Si scrutaris cor meum, si igne me probas, non invenies in me iniquitatem. Non est transgressum os meum hominum more: secundum verbum labiorum Tuorum ego custodivi vias legis*.

Note: The old reading was *vias duras*; modern scholarship has found a better sense: *vias legis*. This expresses more confidence towards God, who imposes his will with suavity of assistance and with encouraging promises of help and reward.

TRUE DETACHMENT FROM THE WORLD

The second thought, beloved sons, We take not from David, Psalmist and Prophet, but from two great Doctors of the Church, Jerome and Augustine.

The Breviary, so familiar to us, supplies the two pages, which are both simple and touching.

The Code of our priestly life, the Volume of our Synod marks the proportions of our detachment from the world and the spirit of our priestly work for souls, whom priests are called—*vocati estis*—to save and sanctify.

St. Jerome speaks with an accent of his own in his commentary. In setting forth the word of St. Peter, he says: *Grandis fiducia. Petrus piscator erat* (We know St. Peter, our own St. Peter) *Dives non fuerat: cibum manu et arte quaerebat: et tamen loquitur confidenter: reliquimus omnia: et quia non sufficit tantum relinquere iungit quod perfectum est: Et secuti sumus te: fecimus quod iussisti: quid igitur nobis dabis praemii?*

Let us fix our eyes on this: *relinquere omnia: Christum sequi*: The two extreme terms suppose that a line of contact remains between the boat and the oars on the one hand, and Jesus Christ, whom we ought to serve and carry, on the other. One does not live, one does not exercise priestly ministry, nor can Holy Church be served in the various offices of her central and universal administration without contacts that bring us up against the world and its spirit. This spirit is not only a sufficiency for the spiritual service of the Lord, but it can and, in fact, does become a daily, seductive temptation of superficiality and coldness in acquitting the tasks of sacerdotal dignity and duty. To be drawn to riches, to seek riches, distinction, honours, personal interests goes badly with *Christum sequi*. We find such seekings in flagrant contradiction with *reliquimus omnia*. Generous abandonment is really the starting point towards the greatness and the true glory of Christianity, of the Church, of the Catholic Priesthood in all ages.

On this point, your Bishop and Father wishes to say something to you, by way of a lament, which comes from his heart and is often, as it were, like a sigh or a groan in his prayer.

The modern expressions of technical progress and superfluous comforts represent a twofold source of dangers. There is the danger that comes from the easy reproduction and harmful diffusion of subtle deviations, intellectual and moral. These in

the concrete, often go the whole way of error and evil. Such things have been from the beginning, but presentation through visual channels, such as press and cinematograph, multiply indefinitely the images and seductions of such error and evil.

We take this occasion to render homage and to give encouragement to the promotion and progress of high-class production, literary and scientific, moral and religious, in all degrees and in all the forms of the good apostolate. We know that such production is notably on the increase, especially in some countries, far and near. Our benevolence and Our praise go to those persons. But, oh, what poverty on our part still, compared with the immense and disgusting deluge of typographical and audiovisual production in the whole world—a deluge which, instead of lifting souls and peoples to the knowledge, love and worship of God, to the cultivation of truth, goodness, pure beauty, justice, fraternity and peace, finishes by corrupting and poisoning all good feeling, sowing destructive seeds of dissolution and ruin.

Beloved sons: in saying these things, you understand how Our conscience of Father and Pastor groans with anguish, as it approaches the consciences of each of you.

Ecce reliquimus omnia et secuti sumus Te. In this *omnia*, which we have left for Christ Jesus, there is also included every application of mind and eye to journals, reviews, books, amusements which, in any way, go against truth, the spirit of Christ, the teaching of Holy Church, the prescriptions and the invitations of the Volume of our sacred Synod.

We ask all Our dear priests to lay their hand on their heart and examine themselves on this matter, which We consider very grave and important.

Side by side with this doctrine suggested by St. Jerome, there comes to us from the “Common of Abbots” a page from another Doctor, whose knowledge and heavenly illumination sets him very high above many other Fathers of the Church.

It is St. Augustine who speaks to us from his tenth sermon, “*De verbis Domini.*” The word, which he sets before us, is not one addressed to Jesus by the Apostles: “*Reliquimus omnia et secuti sumus Te,*” but it is a word of Jesus Himself, an amiable and sweet word spoken to the Apostles and those joined to them: “*Venite ad me, omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis: et ego reficiam vos. Tollite iugum meum super vos, et discite a me, quia mitis*

sum et humilis corde: et invenietis requiem animabus vestris. Iugum enim meum suave est, et onus meum leve."

These are words that promise an exaltation of what seems hard in a priest's life—such things as fatigue, even physical fatigue, hardship and hard striving, pains and anguish, Priests are, indeed, the privileged ones of the Lord, by reason of their vocation, but, in regard to the body, they are mortal men, frail and infirm, very often vessels of clay. Nevertheless, a great reward is laid up for them. It is Jesus, the first Priest, that guarantees it: "*Ego reficiam vos.*"

In the act of giving this assurance, it is noteworthy that Jesus strongly emphasizes the invitation to His intimates to cast away all fear and take His yoke on their shoulders: "*iugum meum super vos.*" He encourages them to take from Him the imitation of His meekness and humility of heart as a guarantee of peace for their souls. Oh! what a horizon is opened before the eyes of every fervent priest by these few gentle words.

The reading of the articles of the Roman Synod, in their superabundance, might leave the impression that a certain exuberance of activity or activism is favoured. Such activism is something to which, in less mature age, noble and fervent souls give themselves with eagerness.

All the same, St. Augustine, taking his inspiration from the words of Jesus, admonishes us to proceed with calm in the government of our energies. "*Si augustiantur vasa carnis, dilatentur spatia caritatis*": and here he finds the prodigious note of accord with that sublime canticle of charity, which St. Paul, in a wonderful page, sets between the feverish impetus, *quae urget*, and the right measure of self-dedication for the glory of Christ and His Gospel and for the salvation of souls.

Therefore, in order to correct and temper the exuberances of activism, it is St. Augustine that gives us the kindly word, explaining to us that the *Iugum Domini super nos* does not mean constructing heaven and earth, creating things visible and invisible, working miracles, raising the dead, but rather keeping ourselves faithful to meekness and lowliness of heart. This, indeed, is the great secret of good success at all times and in every event.

THE LETTERS OF THE FIRST POPE

The third thought, for common encouragement and for the

honour of our Synod, comes to us from the familiar words of St. Peter, the first Bishop of Rome. He was, as you know, the humble Apostle, blessed and holy, and set by Jesus as the foundation stone of the Church, which is one, holy, catholic and apostolic. By divine Providence the Church exercises from Rome, where it holds the primacy of honour and government, its authority over all the Churches scattered throughout the world.

The voice of St. Peter reaches us from distant centuries, as he sent it forth from Rome on two occasions to Christians abroad, those Christians constituting the first communities of the East. The same voice continues to express the heavenly doctrine, the spiritual direction, the good discipline which our Synod contains amidst the later varieties of external circumstances. The provisions, indeed, are equally wise and adapted to the contingencies of actual life.

Those apostolic letters of St. Peter—as also those of St. Paul and all Sacred Scripture—should supply spiritual nourishment for all Catholics throughout the world. Surely, it is with great willingness that We salute this occasion to invite the faithful to correspond with the invitations and directions whereby the Synod encourages the reading of the Sacred Book. In these days ignorance of the Scriptures is really unpardonable in any Catholic who respects himself. St. Peter says that “our dear Brother Paul according to the wisdom given him” (in reference to the patience of our Lord in view of the salvation of all) “touches on some difficult points, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction.”

But this is not said for us priests, for whose sanctification the reading of the Bible can be so advantageous, so rich in helps of every order, spiritual and pastoral.

The two Letters of St. Peter, in regard to the clergy of Rome and the faithful also, would deserve such special study as would bring great familiarity. They should, as it were (it is not too much to say it), be so familiar as to be known, as we say, by heart.

Without entering deeply into citations and references, which would go beyond the limitations of this gathering of ours, We deem sufficient to invite you cordially to the meditation of these two Encyclicals of the first Pope. They contain substantial food in the form of high and practical doctrine; a spirituality which carries us aloft, unexpected, one might say, in the view of most people, but full of sweetness for those who make it familiar to

themselves. St. Paul wrote to the Romans stupendous truths on points of high order and universal interest. St. Peter, on the other hand, wrote from Rome for the encouragement of all priests and faithful Christians, his argument touching chiefly and by preference the conditions of the practical life of the Church and in the Church at all times. Let us priests of the diocese of Rome treasure these Letters. A sample will be enough to make us feel their inebriating power.

The first chapter of the first Letter, for instance! See what it contains: the dignity of the Christian and the sanctity of his life; then, his duties, enhanced by the splendours of grace and belonging to a body which constitutes a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people purchased by God as His own; then, the duty of obedience, the joys of the family and of charity; later on, counsels in expectation of the end, special recommendations for elders and juniors.

For presbyters, especially, what a treasure of heavenly admonition! St. Peter speaks: "*Consenior et testis Christi passionum, qui et eius, quae in futuro revelanda est, gloriae communicator.*" See how he speaks to priests: "*Pascite quae in vobis est gregem Dei, providentes non coacte, sed spontanee secundum Deum, neque turpis lucri gratia, sed voluntarie; neque ut dominantes in cleris, sed forma facti gregis ex animo.*"

SPLENDOURS OF THE DIOCESE OF ROME

The second Letter is less vivacious, less coloured than the first. It deals with matters of discussion, errors to be corrected, false teachers to be avoided.

It is not, however, without a touch of human feeling. Very touching, indeed, is that passage in which St. Peter voices his certainty "*quod velox est depositio tabernaculi mei*" and promises a lasting reminder to his faithful: "*Dabo operam et frequenter habere vos post obitum meum, ut horum memoriam faciatis.*"

Venerable Brethren and beloved sons! Amongst other things, St. Peter, in this second Letter, at the third chapter, verse 8, says: "One thing you must not forget, dearly beloved, that one day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years are as one day."

This hint comes to Us suddenly here at the end of this talk which it has pleased Us greatly to have with you, who prepared with Us the celebration of the Roman Synod.

The conscience of the humble successor of St. Peter holds itself in open view before the Lord with the intention of performing good service as the *servus servorum Dei*, especially in his diocese of Rome. He has had generous collaborators. Indeed, the initiative of the Synod of Rome has in actuality been greatly blessed. That is the reason which suggested this gathering today, that We might manifest to you Our spirit of gratitude. *Dixi et liberavi animam meam.*

The Synod, which has been celebrated, calls for solid complementary work. We shall follow it, step by step, with no impatience, but attentive to seize every circumstance that Providence will offer Us in order to correspond to the good desires of all, to the expectations of the more dedicated souls, to the present needs of Our diocese, beyond and above any resentment regarding any precipitous words, such as sometimes put confusion and uncertainty in timid and weak hearts.

The Synod has taken place, beloved sons; it has been celebrated; it has been promulgated. Now, We naturally think that its actual working depends not so much on Committees of vigilance—these deserve a place of respect—but rather on the conscience of each priest.

For Our part—We love to repeat it—We have now turned Our face confidently, with the serene hope of perfect success, to the great undertaking of the Oecumenical Council, and We pray God to give you also this same confidence. You will have such confidence, beloved sons, in the measure in which you will value the powerful help which can come from the application of the Synodal Constitutions—it can come to each member of the clergy, to the religious communities, to the institutes of higher culture and of ecclesiastical education, to the parishes.

The dioceses of the world look to Rome, to the Pope, to his collaborators, from the highest to the lowest, to his diocese. Let us not disappoint the anxious hope of the pilgrim who directs his steps towards this city so richly blessed. Let us not refuse the task offered to us of being the heralds of the Second Vatican Council—heralds through the spirit of faith, of sincere piety, of order and of peace.

CHARMING TESTIMONY OF PIUS IX

Beloved sons! For some months the Pope has been giving some of his *horae subsecivae* to the latest Councils, with special reference to the First Vatican, and on this very day, hearing

around Our humble person the echoes of so many good words of well-wishing for the continuation of the long life which the Lord has granted Us, We think of Our venerable Predecessor Pius IX of glorious and holy memory, who exactly at Our age, the close of his 79th year and the beginning of his 80th, as happens to Us at this moment, made ready for the immediate opening of the Vatican Council, a Council which was to bring so much good in the spiritual and pastoral order, and actually did bring great good to the Catholic Church throughout the world.

Beloved sons! For some time We like to apply to Ourselves what Cardinal Federico Borromeo said of himself: "God knows my shortcomings, and what I know of them myself is sufficient to confound me." It is because of this, that, in the circumstance of Our 80th year, We beg you to leave Us, as it were, in the shadow of Our great Predecessor Pius IX, about whom We love to read a testimony which We hold in Our personal notes.

"His health is perfect"—wrote Louis Veuillot—"He talks with equal finesse and goodness. His eye unfailingly recognises his friends in a crowd, and he loves to say that he has seen them here and there. His hand, although it upholds such great part of the weight of the world, does not tremble in the least. His ear hears and understands the inner heart moved with respect and love, when any person talks to him in a low voice. His spirit is present to everything, and remembers everything except injuries."

On these souvenirs, and on this distant but very actual encouragement to the perfection of sacerdotal life, for Us and for all of you, We put an end to this talk, and in the paternal wish that all will correspond with the grace of the Lord, be pleased to receive for yourselves and for the souls entrusted to you, Our great Apostolic Blessing.

* * * * *

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

Addition to the Divine Praises

By decree of the S.C.R., under date October 12, 1960, published in A.A.S., No. 14 (December 28) 1960, the invocation or praise: "Blessed be his most Precious Blood" is to be inserted in the Divine Praises after the invocation: "Blessed be His Most Sacred Heart."

W. LEONARD,

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

The Moral Issues in Hormonal Control of Fertility

Widespread interest and discussion have been aroused by recent advances in fertility control. The question of the "oral contraceptive" has long since passed from the pages of medical journals to the columns of the popular magazines and from the moral point of view it will soon be a very live issue for the confessor and anyone who is looked to for pastoral guidance. In America, we learn from a recent issue of *Time*¹, these drugs are now readily available at low cost. No doubt it will very shortly be the same in Australia. It is important, therefore, that the priest be alive to the moral issues involved in the use of these medicaments.

The same edition of *Time* referred to above claims that "the Vatican has not yet defined its position on the pills." This is hardly true. While not all the moral aspects of the question nor all the uses of these various drugs have been clearly delineated and judged by Catholic theology, and while there are still some "twilight areas" where at the moment such delineation and judgment are most difficult, nevertheless the basic principles on which the moral issues are to be solved are clear and certain. Moreover, Pope Pius XII authoritatively passed judgment, as we shall see, on the principal use to which these drugs will surely be put, and bearing on this too is a decree of the Holy Office promulgated as long ago as 1940. It is the purpose of this article to consider these fundamental principles of morality which are involved and some cases which will, I feel, soon be practical ones in this country.

SOME NECESSARY CLARIFICATIONS

The term "oral contraceptive," if it is used (as it is currently being used by many) to cover all types of fertility control by hormonal pills, is very misleading. In the first place, some of these drugs certainly cannot be termed "contraceptive," for they are used or can feasibly be used to attack the embryo after fertilisation has taken place. They could be used, for example, to cause a tubal spasm and thus delay the fertilised ovum too long for its implantation in the uterus; they could bring about an atypical endometrium which is hostile to implantation; they

¹cf. "The Pills," *Time*, February 17, 1961.

could disrupt the metabolism of the parent-embryo complex, in this way hindering normal growth and causing the death of the embryo; they could effect the eradication of an already implanted ovum.² In all these cases the drugs would be foeticidal or abortifacient and not contraceptive. They must be judged by the moral principles governing any medical action which involves the death of an embryo or foetus.

Even when we consider those antifertility drugs whose action is prior to fertilisation of the ovum, the term "oral contraceptive" is still unsatisfactory. The original research on this question was directed largely not to the production of a contraceptive but to the discovery of a remedy for various pathological conditions, including sterility and tendency to abortion.³ The pills which are being produced at the moment will, in fact, have many beneficial uses as far as the correction of disorders of fertility and menstruation and gestation is concerned.

Moreover, there are many ways in which the drugs may come to be used for contraceptive purposes. In the male they could inhibit spermatogenesis or affect one or other component of the seminal fluid, rendering it a less apt medium of sperm transport. In the female the possible ways of preventing conception are far more numerous. It is known, for instance, that once a sperm has penetrated an ovum, a biochemical barrier is set up against the entrance of further sperm. Now the use of phosphorylated hesperidin has been found to produce such a barrier likewise and is proving an effective contraceptive method.⁴ This is clearly illicit: the barrier is "built in," meta-

²cf. Wm. J. Gibbons, S.J.—Thos. K. Burch, "Physiologic Control of Fertility: Process and Morality," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. CXXXVIII (1958), pp. 251-7; D. O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control by Hormonal Medication," *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Vol. XXVII (1960), pp. 7-8; Wm. J. Gibbons, S.J., "Medical Research and Fertility Control," *Catholic Mind*, Vol. LVIII (Sept.-Oct., 1960), pp. 438-9. How medically practicable these possibilities will prove to be and to what extent they will be or have already been availed of remains to be seen. According to reports some antimetabolites have already been used to cause abortion in humans.

³For a popular account of this research, cf. Albert Q. Maisel, "Where do we stand with the Birth-control Pill?," *Reader's Digest*, March, 1961, pp. 51-5; also Gibbons, "Medical Research . . .," pp. 437-8.

⁴cf. A. Snoeck, S.J., "Hesperidin and the Moral Law," *Theology Digest*, Vol. II (1954), pp. 102-5; John J. Lynch, S.J., "Fertility Control and the Moral Law," *Linacre Quarterly*, Vol. XX (1953), pp. 83-8, and "Another Moral Aspect of Fertility Control," *ibid.*, pp. 118-123 (a digest of Fr. Lynch's first article and an abstract of the second may be found in *Theology Digest*, Vol. II (1954), pp. 99-101; Gibbons-Burch, "Physiologic Control . . .," pp. 253 (n. 15), 263 (n. 36); O'Callaghan, "Fertil-

bolised as part of the organism; it is effected prior to the act of intercourse; it is biochemical and not mechanical or chemical—but it is obviously as unlawful as the use of condoms or pessaries or spermicidal jellies. Like them it has no other purpose save that of contraception.⁵

A more complex question is that of the anovulants, those drugs which operate by inhibiting ovulation. The drugs which are being produced commercially at the moment, such as *Enovid* and *Norlutin* are in this class. To understand their action one must note that two phases occur in the female cycle. The first may be termed the estrogenic phase: during it the conditions suitable for fertilisation are induced. The second, the progestational phase, fosters conditions favourable to the implantation of the embryo and to maintenance of pregnancy. The first phase begins with the secretion from the pituitary (a female endocrine gland) of follicle-stimulating hormone. This induces the growth of follicles in the ovary. As they grow, some follicles emit estrogens, master-hormones which produce the conditions requisite for fertilisation. These estrogens, however, inhibit the secretion of follicle-stimulating hormone from the pituitary, which begins instead to secrete luteinising hormone. Now the second phase of the cycle has begun. The luteinising hormone stimulates ovulation from one of the follicles, which after ovulation becomes a yellow mass known as corpus luteum. Acting as a temporary endocrine gland, the corpus luteum produces progesterone, another master-hormone which actively conditions the endometrium for the implantation of the embryo. At the same time the progesterone suppresses the secretion of luteinising hormone from the pituitary, and, in the case where no pregnancy has occurred, this begins once more to secrete follicle-stimulating hormone. The progestational phase has been replaced by the estrogenic phase. The cycle has begun again. If, however, pregnancy occurs, the corpus luteum, together

Footnote (4) continued from P. 103.

ity Control . . .", pp. 6-7; Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., "The New Contraceptive Chemical," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. CXXVI (1952), p. 64; Chas. J. McFadden, O.S.A., *Medical Ethics*, Davis and Co.: Philadelphia, 4th edition (1956), pp. 90-1.

⁵"... the use of phosphorylated hesperidin must be condemned as intrinsically unlawful in all cases since it does not appear to have any purpose except that of contraception." O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 6-7; cf. John R. Connery, S.J., "Notes on Moral Theology," *Theological Studies*, Vol. XIX (1958), p. 549.

with the placenta, continues to produce progesterone, which inhibits further follicular growth and ovulation.⁶

Estrogens and progesterone thus have suppressive effects upon the action of the pituitary, and in the research for the anti-fertility drugs experimentation indicated that to introduce these hormones into the female system created hormonal imbalance with consequent inhibition of ovulation. The anovulants which are being produced commercially now are synthetic hormonal equivalents—*Enovid* and *Norlutin*, for example, are both progesterone-like compounds and produce effects similar to those of the natural hormone itself.⁷ Since it is this type of drug which will be most readily available in the near future, we shall consider the moral issues involved in its use.

A TEMPORARY STERILISATION

No matter what the purpose for which these pills are used, they effect anovulation.⁸ This means sterilisation: the woman is

⁶cf. G. I. M. Swyer, "Physiology of Ovulation, with Special Reference to Oral Contraception," *British Encyclopaedia of Medical Practice, Interim Supplement*, 202 (July, 1959), pp. 2-3; Chas. H. Best-Norman B. Taylor, *The Physiological Basis of Medical Practice*, Williams and Wilkin, 3rd edition, pp. 1246-1304; O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 1-3; Gibbons-Burch, "Physiologic Control . . .", pp. 248-51; Gibbons, "Medical Research . . .", pp. 435-6.

⁷"A field trial by Pincus and his colleagues (1958) in Puerto Rico, using a combination of norethynedrol and ethinyloestradiol-3 methyl-ether (Enavid), resulted in the complete absence of pregnancy in 1299 menstrual cycles when the course of 'medication' was followed accurately." *British Encyclopaedia of Medical Practice, Cumulative Supplement*, 1960, p. 169; cf. also Edward T. Tyler, "Oral Contraception," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. CLXXV, No. 3 (Jan. 21, 1961), pp. 225-6. For the action of these progestational steroids, cf. Swyer, "Physiology . . .", pp. 3-4; *The Year Book of Endocrinology*, Series 1959-60 (ed. Gilbert S. Gordan), Year Book Publishers: Chicago, pp. 342-6; O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 3-4; Gibbons-Burch, "Physiologic Control . . .", p. 254 (n. 18).

⁸We are basing our discussion here on the assumption that the pills do achieve their effect through anovulation. This seems generally accepted now. Thus Swyer ("Physiology . . .", p. 4) concludes his report on the experiments in Puerto Rico and Haiti by saying: "It is quite clear from these reports that a highly effective oral contraceptive, acting by inhibition of ovulation, has been devised." At an earlier stage there was certainly some doubt at least on this point. Dr. Pincus, who has led the research in this field, said in 1955: "There is a suggestion in our data that in women exogenous oral progesterone may act as an antifertility agent for reasons other than its ovulation-inhibiting action. The frequent occurrence of atypical endometria and already mentioned indication of suppressive action on endogenous progestin suggest possible effects on ovum and sperm transport and on implantation." (cf. G. Pincus, "Some Effects of Progesterone and Related Compounds Upon Reproduction and Early Development of Mammals,"

physiologically prevented from ovulating and is thus rendered sterile at a time when nature intends she should be fertile. This is, true enough, a temporary sterilisation, not a permanent sterilisation. It is a physiological, not a surgical sterilisation. It is a functional, not an organic sterilisation. But it is sterilisation nonetheless, and the teaching of the Church is that direct sterilisation is immoral. In 1940 the Holy Office decreed that direct sterilisation, whether perpetual or temporary, whether of a man or of a woman, was unlawful, adding that it was forbidden by the natural law.⁹ Pius XII reaffirmed this teaching in many of his addresses,¹⁰ defining direct sterilisation more than once as "that which aims at rendering procreation impossible, either as a means to an end or as an end in itself."¹¹ We need to remember this definition. It involves our text-book distinction between *voluntarium in se sed propter aliud* and *voluntarium in se et propter se*: in either case it is a question of *directe voluntarium*. In the case, for example, where a woman is sterilised because a further pregnancy would endanger her life, one may be tempted to look upon the sterilisation as indirect. In reality it is direct sterilisation. Both the end and the means to the end are directly intended.

Why is direct sterilisation morally evil? Because the reproductive function as such is not subordinated to the individual. It has a finality of its own, being directed to the good of the species rather than to the good of the individual. The individual's direct right over this power is therefore limited to

Footnote (8) continued from P. 105.

Proceedings of Fifth International Conference on Planned Parenthood, Tokyo, 1955, pp. 175-84—cited by Gibbons-Burch, "Physiologic Control . . .", p. 254, n. 17). Moreover, the *Interim Supplement* (July, 1959) of the *British Encyclopaedia of Medical Practice*, in its abstract of the report which Pincus and his associates published in 1958 (cf. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, Vol. LXXV, 1333), refers still to the "*presumption of suppression of ovulation*" (p. 5. Italics mine). Obviously, if the pills have their effect in some way other than by suppression of ovulation, especially if they may possibly attack an already fertilised ovum, this will affect the evaluation of the moral issues involved.

⁹cf. A.A.S., Vol. XXXII (1940), p. 73.

¹⁰cf. A.A.S., Vol. XLIII (1951), pp. 843-4; Vol. XLV (1953), p. 606; Vol. L (1958), p. 734.

¹¹"La stérilisation directe, disions—Nous le 29 octobre, 1951, c'est-à-dire celle qui vise, comme moyen ou comme but, à rendre impossible la procréation, est une violation grave de la loi morale, et donc elle est illicite." Pius XII, Address to the Seventh International Convention of the International Society of Haematology, September 12, 1958, A.A.S., Vol. L (1958), p. 734; cf. *ibid.*, Vol. XLIII (1951), p. 843.

use and non-use and goes no further.¹² Accordingly, for an action resulting in sterility to be licit, it must be an indirect sterilisation, satisfying the principle of the twofold effect.

In addition it must satisfy the principle of totality. Besides having a social function and purpose, the reproductive organs are part of the human body and as such are subordinated to the good of the whole organism. Any procedure resulting in sterility involves two things: a direct mutilation, since an organ or its function is removed or suppressed, and a sterilisation, either direct or indirect, because the procreative power as such is destroyed or temporarily inhibited. As a bodily mutilation it must satisfy the principle of totality; in other words, its presence or its functioning must constitute a danger to the whole organism. As a sterilisation, it must be indirect; that is, it must satisfy the principle of the twofold effect. To accord with this principle the evil effect must not be intended but merely permitted, and, moreover, the good effect must at least be as immediate as the evil effect. If the agent does intend the evil effect or if this is the sole immediate effect of the action, the principle cannot be invoked. Hence, in the case of sterilisation, either the intention of the agent or the nature of the action can render it a direct sterilisation. To sum up, we may say that a procedure involving sterilisation will be licit only when it is therapeutically necessary and the sterility is merely its unintentional by-product.¹³

SOME APPLICATIONS

CONTRACEPTIVE USES

The antifertility pills will be used for the most part as straightout contraceptives. In view of the principles we have been considering there is no doubt about the unlawfulness of such a use. The pills are taken in order to avoid conception: both the end and the means to the end, it is to be remembered, are willed and sought directly. While it cannot be said that the intention to avoid conception is illicit in itself *suppositis supponendis* (for the same end is intended in the practice of the rhythm), the means to this end are definitely immoral when oral

¹²cf. G. Kelly, S.J., "Pope Pius XII and the Principle of Totality," *Theological Studies*, Vol. XVI (1955), p. 383; O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 8-9.

¹³cf. O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 9-10; Kelly, "Pope Pius XII . . .", p. 382.

contraceptives are employed. Here what is intended is the stripping of the marriage act of its natural efficacy through the inhibition of ovulation. Now to deprive the marriage act of its inherent force constitutes a grave sin against the Sixth Commandment, and the inhibition of ovulation—here a direct sterilisation—constitutes a grave sin against the Fifth Commandment, involving as it does a directly intended suppression of the generative power.¹⁴

This is true, no matter what may be the motive leading one to practise contraception in this way. Even when it is done for ostensibly therapeutic reasons, as, for example, when a pregnancy would be dangerous to life or health, it is still a case of contraception through direct sterilisation and therefore an immoral procedure. Pope Pius XII made this clear. He was speaking of the oral contraceptives when he said:

“A *direct* and hence an unlawful sterilisation is induced when ovulation is inhibited to save the uterus or organism from the consequences of a pregnancy which they cannot support. Some moralists claim that it is permissible to take these medicaments for this purpose, but they are wrong. One must equally reject the opinion of a number of doctors and moralists, who would allow the use of these medicaments when a medical indication renders too early a conception undesirable, or in other similar cases which it is not possible to mention here. In these cases the use of the medicaments has for its purpose the prevention of conception by the prevention of ovulation. It is a question therefore of direct sterilisation.”¹⁵

THERAPEUTIC USES

These same drugs, however, can be employed to great advantage in the treatment of various pathological conditions, as, for example, in the relief of dysmenorrhea or menorrhagia.¹⁶ Through the hormonal treatment the endocrine activity which precedes and accompanies ovulation is inhibited, with the result that the proliferation of the endometrium is checked. Conse-

¹⁴cf. O'Callaghan, “Fertility Control . . .”, p. 5; Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., “The Contraceptive Pill,” *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. CXXXVII (1957), p. 51; L. L. McReavy, “Oral Contraceptives,” *Clergy Review*, Vol. XLIV (1959), pp. 432-5; Gibbons-Burch, “Physiologic Control . . .”, pp. 269-73; John J. Farraher, S.J., “Notes on Moral Theology,” *Theological Studies*, Vol. XXI (1960), p. 599; cf. cited articles of J. J. Lynch, vide *Theology Digest*, Vol. II (1954), pp. 99-101.

¹⁵A.A.S., Vol. L (1958), p. 735. Translation mine.

¹⁶cf. O'Callaghan, “Fertility Control . . .”, pp. 10-11; *The Year Book of Endocrinology* (1959-60 Series), pp. 345-6.

quently, prolonged and painful menstruation is avoided. Here the conditions demanded by the principle of the twofold effect are fulfilled. The resultant anovulation is an unintentional side-effect: the relief of the disorders results not from the sterility as such, but from the suppression of hormonal activity.

Does such a procedure also satisfy the principle of totality? It is certainly therapeutic, inhibiting a function that is detrimental to the organism as a whole. The question now hinges on the sufficiency of the cause. For a lawful anatomical or functional sterilisation, Pope Pius XII demanded that the preservation or functioning of an organ must be a cause of serious damage to the whole body or a serious threat to it.¹⁷ He was dealing directly with permanent mutilation, and since a temporary mutilation is far less serious, it will be justified by a less serious pathological condition. Indeed, one may say that whenever a disorder is causing undue discomfort and no other equally effective remedy is available, or whenever a conscientious doctor prescribes such therapy, it may be presumed that the procedure is justified.¹⁸ This is obviously the case in situations such as we are discussing here. The relief of menstrual disorders, for example, is undoubtedly a sufficient reason for permitting a temporary and indirect sterilisation.

REGULARISATION OF THE FEMALE CYCLE

Since the regularity of the monthly cycle is the basis of periodic continence as a means of avoiding conception, the question whether the anovulants may lawfully be used to regulate the cycle is of great importance. Nature certainly

¹⁷cf. Address to the 26th Congress of the Italian Society of Urology, October 8, 1953, A.A.S., Vol. XLV (1953), pp. 673-4; also *ibid.*, Vol. XLIV (1952), p. 782.

¹⁸"Is it lawful to prevent ovulation by means of pills used as a remedy for aggravated reactions of the uterus or the organism, even though this medicament, by inhibiting ovulation, renders fecundation impossible? Is this permitted to a married woman who, despite this temporary sterility, desires to have relations with her husband? The answer depends on the person's intention. If the woman takes this medicament, not in order to prevent conception, but solely on the doctor's advice as a remedy necessitated by a malady of the uterus or the organism, she induces an *indirect* sterilisation, which is permissible according to the general principle of actions with a twofold effect." Pius XII, A.A.S., Vol. L (1958), p. 735. Translation mine. cf. O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 10-11; McReavy, "Oral Contraceptives," p. 434; Connell, "Contraceptive Pills," pp. 50-1; Farragher, "Notes . . .", p. 599-601, Gibbons-Burch, "Physiologic Control . . .", pp. 264-5.

intends that the cycle should be regular. The female organism is geared to effect a uniform pattern. In the case of what is definitely a pathological irregularity, there is no doubt that such therapy is licit. Any sterility that occurs as a result—if indeed we should regard the suppression of abnormally irregular ovulation as a sterilisation—will be indirect and therapeutic.¹⁹

But when is an irregularity of the cycle to be deemed pathological? Some irregularity is observable in many women. May the use of hormonal medication be permitted in order to remedy even a slight irregularity? Is it lawful by such means to preclude possible variations due to excessive mental or physical fatigue, emotional upsets, change of climate or altitude? May, for instance, a definite, unvarying period be established in this way, so that the date of ovulation can be determined without error each month and the use of the rhythm may thus be rendered secure? Here we have a "twilight area" where, at the moment at least, a moral judgment is not easy. For one thing, more scientific data is looked for in order to establish what in fact does constitute a normal cycle, when irregularity may be regarded as abnormal, and in what precise way hormonal medication can be made effective in the treatment of irregularities. Certainly such therapy, if it is to be licit, must be merely regulatory and not a suspension of ovulation beyond normal limits. To date, the moralists would seem to be at one in tending to allow such treatment, provided that the normal limits are observed.²⁰ Father Thiéffry, however, in his recent article,²¹ will not admit the liceity of such regulation when its sole purpose is to render possible or more secure the use of the rhythm. In such a case, he maintains, one cannot speak of a therapeutical indication and

¹⁹"The act of administering drugs to correct hormonal imbalance has as good effect the regulation of a pathologically abnormal cycle, and as bad effect temporary sterility due to the deferring of these irregular ovulations. The correction of the abnormal condition is not attained through the sterility, i.e. through the suppression of ovulation precisely as this is a source of new life . . ." O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 11-12.

²⁰cf. Connery, "Notes . . .", p. 550; O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 11-13; Connell, "Contraceptive Pills," p. 50; Gibbons-Burch are more hesitant when it is not a case of anovulation or definite cyclic disorder to be remedied (cf. "Physiologic Control . . .", pp. 267-9).

²¹cf. M. Thiéffry, S.J., "Stérilisation hormonale et morale chrétienne," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Vol. LXXXIII (1961), pp. 145-50.

consequently cannot appeal to the principle of totality to justify the anovulation that results.

OVULATION-REBOUND

In the course of the research and experimentation in connection with the antifertility pill, it was discovered that, after ceasing the treatment with the anovulants, many women conceived almost immediately.²² It seems that over the period of sterility caused by the drugs there is a concentration of hormonal resources, so that, when the treatment is ceased, conditions are far more favourable to conception and gestation. In view of this "rebound" effect, the hormonal medication can feasibly be used to treat sterile or sub-fertile patients—in fact, this was the end that many investigators had in view from the outset in their search for the antifertility drugs. Would such therapy be permissible? There is no sterilisation and hence no problem in the case of the already sterile subject. In the case of the sub-fertile, since the more favourable conditions for conception are induced, as far as can be judged, not by the sterility as such, but by the concomitant build-up of endocrine resources, the sterilisation would be once again indirect and therapeutic and therefore morally admissible.²³

FERTILITY CONTROL DURING LACTATION

During the period of lactation conception is as a normal rule impossible, for owing to hormonal activity ovulation is generally suspended. This is nature's way of allowing the mother to recover from the previous birth and of lightening the burdens of parenthood by spacing children more widely. Would it be lawful, in view of this fact, to second and ensure the natural anovulation through hormonal medication, compensating in this way for any failure of the natural endocrine activity? The question was broached by Father Janssens of Louvain, who replied in the affirmative in an article he published in 1958.²⁴ For

²²"... the ease with which conception has occurred on cessation of medication has been striking." *British Encyclopaedia of Medical Practice, Cumulative Supplement* (1960), p. 169; cf. E. T. Tyler-H. J. Olson, "Fertility Promoting and Inhibiting Effects of New Steroid Hormonal Compounds," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. CLXIX, 1843-54 (April 18, 1959).

²³cf. O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 14-15.

²⁴cf. L. Janssens, "L'inhibition de l'ovulation est-elle moralement licite?", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, Vol. XXXIV (1958), pp. 357-60.

the case where the mother is in fact breast-feeding her child, Father O'Callaghan of Maynooth agreed with him.²⁵ However, in his notes on current Moral Theology in *Theological Studies*,²⁶ Father Farraher, S.J., challenged Father O'Callaghan's conclusion on the grounds that, as Father O'Callaghan had himself stated, it is not only the nature of the act but also the intention that affects the morality of such a procedure. "If the intention is bad," Father O'Callaghan had written, "i.e., if it aims at contraception or sterilization, there is no need to examine the physical act itself since the whole human act is objectively wrong."²⁷ Father Farraher went on to claim that in the case under discussion the intention is certainly aiming at contraception. The question, of course, is solved only by determining very specifically the precise malice of contraception. To aim at depriving the marriage act of its power when nature intends that power to be present is certainly a contraceptive intent. Is it the same when one aims at depriving the act of its power when nature intends it should be absent? In any case, it is interesting to note Father Farraher's observation that if the intention were to aid the proper production of milk for the baby, the medication would seem to be lawful as "an ordinary application of the principle of double effect."

Father Thiéffry, S.J., adds much interesting and morally significant data to this particular question.²⁸ He cites authors who question whether an ovulation occurring during lactation is abnormal and due to a failure in the natural mechanism. Until the natural character of the restraint of ovarian function during lactation is established, together with the normal duration of such inhibition, Father Thiéffry finds it impossible to pass a definitive, morally favourable judgment on the use of hormonal medication during lactation, such as Father Janssens has done. Moreover, Father Thiéffry excludes any use of such medication for the purpose of avoiding an undesirable pregnancy: he would allow it only in so far as it is therapeutically justified as the remedy of a natural mechanism that is at fault. It is, he says, only the existence or the serious threat of a pathological state

²⁵cf. O'Callaghan, "Fertility Control . . .", pp. 13-14; also Connery, "Notes . . .", pp. 550-1.

²⁶cf. Farraher, "Notes . . .", pp. 600-1.

²⁷"Fertility Control . . .", p. 15.

²⁸cf. "Stérilisation hormonale . . .", pp. 152-7.

or of a quite abnormal situation which will justify such hormonal sterilisation.

DELAYING OF MENSTRUATION

Would hormonal therapy be justified in order to retard menstruation, in the case, for example, of a woman who wished to delay menstruating until after an athletic contest? In itself, the suppression or retarding of menstruation raises no moral problem, and so, if the treatment did not prove anovulatory, the procedure would be quite lawful. What of the case where ovulation is inhibited or a subsequent ovulation is unduly deferred? One may argue that here the sterilisation is indirect, but it is not therapeutic. It may satisfy the principle of the twofold effect, but it fails to respect the principle of totality. A serious suppression of function can be justified only if the good of the organism as a whole calls for it. Such is not the case surely when this suppression is motivated by the mere desire to engage more freely in sport or by some similar motive.²⁹

CONCLUSION

There are, of course, many other aspects of this problem which will need to be discussed. In one's moral judgment and pastoral counsel account will have to be taken, for example, of the possibility and probability of abuse, of the temptation to will directly the sterility which is a by-product of therapeutic treatment, of the harmful consequences which time may prove to be consequent upon interference with such a delicate mechanism as the female organism.³⁰ Please God, further theological discussion and investigation will soon cast the question into clearer relief and provide us with more definite solutions for the problems that will shortly be confronting us.

NICHOLAS CROTTY, C.P.

St. Paul's Retreat, Urrbrae, Mitcham, South Australia.

²⁹cf. D. O'Callaghan's reply to Dr. J. D. Acland, "Correspondence," *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Vol. XXVII (1960), pp. 337-8.

³⁰"As a matter of fact, commenting on the Planned Parenthood Federation's decision in a letter to its medical committee, Dr. Howard C. Taylor, Jr., editor of the *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, has indicated that he believes the question of possible long-term side effects will not be settled for several more years." Tyler, "Oral Contraception," p. 225; cf. Swyer, "Physiology . . .", p. 4.

Grace and Person

There are few truths of the faith of which the average Catholic is more convinced than his need of grace to "do anything which pertains to eternal life." There is probably no truth which he understands less. There are many priests who, when explaining to the non-philosophically minded what they learned in the seminary (that sanctifying grace is a quality inhering in the substance of the soul; actual grace a transitory help of illumination or inspiration; the infused virtues proximate principles of operation, etc.) . . . feel that they are not explaining anything at all. For, they are in fact, telling people that, by means of some help they do not understand, they are enabled to do acts beyond their natural powers, which have a value beyond their perception. Any priest who opens his theology text-book to help him explain to ordinary people the supernatural life which is theirs, will wonder whether he can make them see how it touches them where they live—even if he sees it himself.

In recent years, the catechetical movement has given a ray of hope with an explanation of the supernatural life in more personal terms. Still, some of us, while gratefully accepting the help thus provided, will have had doubts whether, in limiting ourselves to these non-technical expositions, we are being really theological, and giving the full content of the faith. The purpose of this and subsequent articles will be to develop the truth that "the theology of grace can be wholly explained in personal categories."¹ I would go further and say that unless this is done, the revealed doctrine of the life which Christ came to give is de-vitalised and dulled. Before proceeding, let me say once and for all that I am most convinced of the absolute necessity of sound speculative theology—as was stressed by *Humani Generis*. Without it we can not safeguard the real meaning and value of the immutable truth of revealed doctrines. However, scholastic explanation of revealed doctrine should not be regarded as the most important thing in a presentation of that doctrine. For ordinary Christian living, and even for a fuller spiritual life, it is often not necessary to expound much of it at all.

¹Alfarc, S.J., "*Persona y Gracia*," *Gregorianum*, XLI, 1 (1960), p. 5ff.

To see what I mean by this, let us compare briefly the theology of "De Verbo Incarnato" with that of "De Gratia." If the Incarnation is a reality, there must necessarily be, in the human nature of Christ, a created *gratia unionis*, a real relation of the humanity to the Word, and the human nature subsisting with the subsistence of the Word. However, when we teach and preach the doctrine, the insistence is rightly on the fact that in a true human nature we see the Son of God Himself becoming man, acting and living and dying for the salvation of mankind, and what a wonderful thing it is that the Person of the Word took flesh and dwelt amongst us. We do not feel that we fail in our presentation of the doctrine if we omit the speculative theology. Yet, in the doctrine of grace, it is the other way round. Scripture and the Fathers speak of it as an entering into a personal union of knowledge, friendship and love with the three Divine Persons. This is a mysterious reality, yet one fraught with meaning and life-value. In the course of the centuries, in order to safeguard the reality and the splendour of these living data of revelation, it has been necessary to insist on the scholastically expressed truths of quality, habit, principles of operation, etc. These are like the foundations of the building. Foundations are necessary things, but in themselves they do not always manifest much unity or beauty of design. You do not take a visitor through the dark basement of a cathedral, pointing out the purpose of the foundations, and asking him to imagine the beauty of the stained-glass windows and gothic arches above. Yet, have we not done the equivalent in our teaching of the doctrine of grace? Which may be why, although we hold most strongly to the truths taught, we do not always find it easy to grasp the unity of the whole, and also why, in the doctrine of grace and the virtues, there are more unanswered and disputed questions than in most tracts of theology.

Hence, I shall try to show, briefly:

- (1) That the doctrine of grace and the virtues, expounded from the point of view of a personal union with the three divine persons, is much more intelligible and has a much more vital meaning, not only for the laity but for those of us who have learned our theology from the standard textbooks.
- (2) That such an exposition does suppose all the certain

speculative theology as its foundation, and is therefore fully "theological."

- (3) That many of the difficulties which arise in an exclusively scholastic presentation, cease, in this light, to present any real difficulty at all.

(These two latter points will be done more fully in later articles).

THE SUPERNATURAL

One of our prime concerns in explaining the life of grace is to safeguard the supernatural. But "the supernatural," as a term, has very little positive meaning, even for a theologian: it means only (with all its precisions) what is above created nature, and 'not natural to man.' The non-theologian concludes that it is therefore quite beyond his comprehension. *Positively*, we can express the reality by saying that the supernatural means our being taken into a relationship of personal friendship, knowledge and love with the Three Divine Persons.² The beatific vision is not just "seeing God" in the way a modern TV-conditioned layman would understand the phrase; it is being taken into the heart-filling happiness of intimate personal union with the three perfect Persons.³ Everything that man can know of what personal union in love can mean can, and should, give him some knowledge—shadowy, distant, analogous, but nevertheless true—of what this eternal, all-absorbing ecstatic union with the Three Divine Persons will be for him. To give some idea of what this eternal personal union with God will be, Scripture appeals to every possible human relationship of personal knowledge and love—friendship, marriage, family life in all its aspects. Instead of speaking of the supernatural as a lifting up above nature, we could say it is being drawn in to personal intimacy with a personal God: fully in heaven, partly even now.

From this point of view, it is not difficult to get even the simplest to see what we try to express by "the supernatural" (a more exact theological analysis will be done in a later article)—something to which a man has no rights, for which he has no natural capacity. He has no capacity, unless God gives it, for

²Cf. Mersch, S.J., "The Theology of the Mystical Body," Herder, St. Louis, p. 465ff.

³Cf. Troisfontaines, "Le Ciel," Nouvelle Revue Theologique, March, 1960.

friends must meet on terms of some sort of 'equality.' He has no rights to it, nor claim on it, for all invitations to personal friendship are freely given. The office secretary can wish that her young and charming millionaire boss might "regard her as a person," take her out to dinner, and ask her to share his life and fortune in marriage. But she knows that this would be complete gratuity. When it is a question of God's calling us to share His love and friendship—us who are His creatures—the sheer "grace" of it is more clearly evidenced.

IMMANENCE

This brings us to a most important point which has been much stressed in recent theology (and one not brought out in the text-books)—the immanence of the supernatural, i.e., the fact that the supernatural is in perfect harmony with all a man's deepest natural aspirations. "Grace perfects nature." There are well-known examples of illustrations of "supernatural life, and higher principles of operation;" v.g., a cat needing a higher nature, or capacity of operation if it is to enjoy an opera. These are useful examples, as far as they go; but they don't go far enough. A cat does not want to enjoy an opera, and if it becomes capable of doing so, it ceases to be a cat. But man does want to know and love God, and by being able to do so, becomes more perfectly a man. The supernatural is not adequately represented unless it is clearly seen as responding to and in harmony with a man's natural aspirations. The "personal" line is here most efficacious. This point also will be developed later. Here it is sufficient to point out how, while it is evident that personal friendship with God is something to which man has no right nor claim, it is nevertheless something to which, when its possibility is made known, man's nature responds, and which brings to perfection his whole nature.

Here I think it useful to note that in order to convey the notion of what is meant in theology by "the supernatural," it is not necessary to have a clear knowledge of "pure nature," and what the final goal of man would have been had he not been called to the Beatific Vision. Theologically, we must hold that God could have created man yet not destined him for the face to face vision of God; just what his goal would then have been, theology does not tell us.⁴ Philosophers differ about it, but we need not

⁴Humani Generis says only that God could have created man without destining him for the beatific vision.

know just what it would have been.⁵ Revelation teaches of two states of man: the state of original justice and the present state. We know that God created man for the Beatific Vision, that he never had any other destiny. We must not think of God creating our human "nature," and then as a kind of afterthought deciding to destine us for the Beatific Vision. Man was created for the supernatural! This means that you cannot easily draw a clear line between the natural and the supernatural. Man, as he is, body and soul is made for the vision of God, and therefore, in his whole being, in some way orientated towards that goal. This is most important. The failure to realise this has sent writers to inanimate examples to try to explain the supernatural: boats with sails and oars, petrol in cars, cabbages that walk, etc. But the God who made us for personal union with Himself has given us—in the human nature He gave us, with our need for love and friendship and personal union with another, and all that these things mean to us—the best way of knowing something of what an eternal sharing in his personal life will be.

SANCTIFYING GRACE

Sanctifying grace and faith and charity are "the beginning of eternal life in us" even now because we are taken into relations of personal friendship with God—and this is called justification. I have a text-book which treats of the realities of justification in this order:

- (a) Justification is an internal renovation of man.
- (b) In justification, a created gift is infused into man's soul: a physical quality, an entitative habit inhering in the substance of the soul.
- (c) As a result, man is made a sharer in the divine nature, and an adopted son of God.
- (d) Further (by way of corollary!) he becomes a friend of God.

This may be good theology; but it is more alive, more in accord with the order of revelation—and better theology—to put things the other way round: God wants us to enter into a personal relationship with Himself, fully in heaven, truly even now; to make us His children, to unite Himself to us in friendship and personal presence, sharing His life of knowledge and love. Now

⁵Cf. De Broglie, "*De Fine Ultimo Humanae Vitae*," Beauchesne, Paris, 1958, p. 183f.

all this cannot be unless He produces in us an inner transformation and elevation: the created reality.

For St. Paul, for example—to cite only one of the New Testament writers—"grace is not a thing, but God loving, and giving Himself, or, if you wish, his relation of charity and generosity towards men. Whence you can call grace the superabundant gifts of salvation. . . ."⁶ It was to make us His sons that God sent out His Son on a mission to us (Gal. 4, 4f), to take us into intimate friendship with Himself. We are taught "to invoke God with the name which Christ used in speaking to His Father: Abba. It is also the word which Jesus used in regard to St. Joseph. In their prayers, the Israelites said 'Abi, Father,' while the term Abba is intimate and familiar, corresponding well to the French 'Papa.' It follows that, in daring to pronounce such a name, the Christian does not appeal to the loving and helping providence of God the Creator, but precisely to this relation of paternity, by which God gives him a share in His own nature and calls him into the family-circle of the Trinity: 'You are no longer strangers or exiles, then, or aliens; the saints are your fellow-citizens, you belong to God's household' (Eph. 2:19)."⁷

One writer⁸ gives an illustration which is excellent in this context: that of the parents of an idiot child. They look on this child which they have begotten, and their deepest desire is that it should share their life—their human life of knowledge, love and laughter and family happiness. But, with its malformed brain-cells, it is capable of no more than an animal-like attachment; it lives in its own self-centred world, apart. An inner transformation, giving it a higher human power of knowing and loving, would be needed before it could share their love and friendship, living fully as their child and their image. The application of the illustration to God and his grace is evident, as is also the most meaningful order in the presentation of grace. The tremendous truth is not that we have an entitative habit infused; it is God's longing for men (who fail to recognise the lower level on which they live) to share the life of knowledge and love and delight which is the life of Father, Son and Spirit. To make this sharing possible, the God who created us to His image gives us new

⁶Spicq., O.P., "*Vie Morale et Trinite Sainte selon St. Paul*," Ed. du Cerf, Paris, 1957, p. 27.

⁷Ib., p. 53f.

⁸Fr. L. Trese, "*Many are One*," p. 3.

powers, to know and love on the "divinely personal" level: grace and infused virtues. St. Thomas followed this order. In the *Summa*, he treats in Pars I, q.43, of the Divine Persons giving themselves to us. It is at the end of the *Prima Secundae* that he studies the created reality as such. In Pars I, grace is the "potestas fruendi divina Persona" (q.43, a.3—Holy Spirit; a.4, ad 1—the Father; a.5, ad 2—the Son. cf. also q. 38, art. 1). I think this is a definition we could well popularise: "grace is the power of enjoying and delighting in the divine Persons." I would also be inclined to agree with Father Mersch, S.J., who wrote that we should not try to fit grace too strictly into ready-made categories supplied by philosophy. "Since we are dealing with a new kind of being, we shall do well to designate it by a new word. To express the action producing it we have suggested the term 'causality of union' . . . and to represent the type of being thus realised, the term 'entity of union'."⁹ I think we could make that: 'entity of personal union.'

FAITH

The theological virtues are easily explained from this personal point of view. However, in concluding this article, it would be well to stress the personal character of faith—briefly only, since it has been widely treated in recent years.¹⁰ In its living reality, the call to faith and justification is God's invitation to enter into this relationship of personal friendship. We do not go to pagans bearing, in one hand a table of commandments to be kept, and in the other a set of propositions to be believed. St. John has a most enlightening phrase when he describes how he and his fellow Christians were justified: "Et nos credidimus caritati."¹¹ Not just belief, but believing in God's love. For St. Paul, too, "the object of the Christian faith will be to believe in the love of God who pardons sin, and makes everything help to secure the good of those who love Him."¹² God's revelation does contain propositions to be assented to as true; but they are a very special sort of proposition, expressing God's personal self-

⁹Mersch., op. cit., p. 458.

¹⁰Mouroux, "I believe," Chapman, London, 1959. Joly, "What is Faith." Faith and Fact series, Burns and Oates, London, 1958. Barosse, "The relationship of love to faith in St. John," Theological Studies, 1957, p. 538ff. "Christianity, Mystery of Love," C.B.Q., 1958, p. 137, and many other articles.

¹¹I. Jo. 4, 16.

¹²Spicq., op. cit., p. 28.

revelation. In human life, a young man's proposal of marriage is a statement of truth—it is also a very special self-revelation, a revealing of his mind and heart, of his most intimate personal life.

God's self-revelation bears a similar stamp: it is God making Himself known to us in the desire that we should meet Him in the personal encounter of conversion, giving Him our love, willing to share in His life. Faith means that "we have learned to recognise the love God has in our regard, and to make it our belief"¹¹. It is, of course, in Christ that we see and accept this love.¹³ St. John's whole Gospel is to show how the Word who, in the beginning lived in close intimacy with His Father,¹⁴ came to reveal to men something of that intimate knowledge and love which was His, and which He came to share with men.

It is, strictly speaking, charity which justifies us. But, as St. Thomas says, there could be no charity or love of friendship towards God, unless man were called to the Beatific Vision. There could be no charity in man unless he believed in the love of God for him, God willing man to share in His life and love (at least in the general sense of God the rewarder of those who seek Him). From the fact that he knows that he is called to share in the personal life of God, and wills to accept the call, a love of charity or friendship must arise in man.¹⁵

This way of viewing faith throws much light on the nature of actual grace in preparation for justification (as we hope to see later) and the many personal reasons which prevent a man from embracing the faith. Faith is "an act of the intellect assenting," as every text-book says. It is more, for in its living context it is the willed assent of the whole human person to the call of a personal God: and in the unity of that personal assent, faith, hope and charity are blended:

"Biblical faith is the acceptance of the alliance which God offers to man. Faith which God asks of man is analogous to that which husband and wife give one another and which unites them forever. This profound analogy is more than mere metaphor:

¹³Cf. I Jo. 4, 9.

¹⁴Jo. 1, 2 (pros ton Theon—indicating intimacy); 1, 18—"in sinu Patris," a term designating special intimacy, v.g. conjugal, as in Num. 11, 12; Deut. 13, 6.

¹⁵II II, q. 23, a. 1.

for by this full faith which is confidence and fidelity, man comes to true knowledge of God, to this concrete knowledge which only perfect intimacy gives, that which unites husband and wife. This is what God Himself said to His people by the mouth of Osee:

'Et sponsabo te mihi in fide (en pistei);
et scies (epignose) quia ego Dominus.' (Os. 2:20) . . .

Since the coming of Christ, the call of God is new; new because God speaks to us through His Son; new because God invites us to share in the love which unites Him to His Son, and to become His children . . . faith our reply to this new call, acceptance of Christ . . . opens our souls to the charity of Christ . . . a renewed hope, the hope of the child of God, his confidence in his Father whose love he shares, because he has given himself to this love, and already shares in it."¹⁶

In this personal context, faith and grace, charity and hope (our spiritual, supernatural life), while entailing all the exactness of speculative theology for their fuller explanation, take on a much richer meaning.

E. J. CUSKELLY, M.S.C.

Sacred Heart Monastery, Croydon, Victoria.

SHORT NOTICE

CHRIST IS GOD, by J. P. Arendzen. Canterbury book. London: Sheed and Ward, 1959; 95 pages; 3/6. A section from "Whom do you say?"

This book is a short treatise on the Incarnation. It deals in a very simple fashion with most of the points dealt with in the theological treatise, "De Verbo Incarnato." Canon Arendzen begins by proving the divinity of Christ from the New Testament. He then states the Church's Christological doctrine as defined by the Council of Chalcedon and goes on to discuss the terms used and the nature of the union of the two natures in Christ. He also discusses the perfections of the human nature of Christ, His wills and His knowledge, and concludes by treating two common objections proposed to disprove the divinity of Christ.

The author gives us a clear and simple exposition of this fundamental truth and throughout the book he proposes and answers difficulties against the Catholic doctrine. This book would be useful to any layman wishing to inform himself on this matter or to a non-Catholic seeking the Church's teaching on Christ.

D.W.

¹⁶Lacan: "Les Trois qui demeurent," *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses*, 1958, p. 321f.

Sponsors at Confirmation

With the gradual separation of Confirmation from Baptism it became customary to require special sponsors who would discharge at the sacrament of Confirmation a function in many ways parallel with that of the godparents at Baptism.

To the confirmational sponsor the present Code of Canon Law devotes a separate chapter,¹ which begins by recalling the venerable nature of this institution:

Ex vetustissimo Ecclesiae more, ut in baptismo, ita etiam in confirmatione adhibendus est patrinus, si haberi possit.²

According to the Church's age-old custom, as in Baptism, so in Confirmation, a sponsor should, if possible, be used.

In fact, our earliest extant records of this immemorial custom lead us back to certain French synods belonging to the eighth and ninth centuries: Compiègne (757), Chalon (813), Paris (829).³ In forbidding parents and public penitents to be sponsors, these synods assume confirmational sponsorship as an established institution.

Running like a burden through the official documents which in every century deal with sponsors is the reproof of a recurrent abuse, one that might be termed: block sponsorship—to wit, using a single sponsor to stand for a whole group of candidates. A tendency in this direction still persists, because the practical difficulties are not mean. If all the children of a certain age-group in a thickly populated parish are to be confirmed on a week-day, at least two big difficulties will normally arise: that of assembling a sufficient number of suitable adults to be sponsors; and that of avoiding a certain “traffic congestion,” if a large crowd of mingled children and adults (who have not previously met to be marshalled and rehearsed) is milling around His Lordship at the sanctuary. Plainly matters become simplified if one person is allowed to act as sponsor for the entire gathering of candidates.

Canon 794 deals with this theme:

Patrinus unum tantum confirmandum aut duos

The sponsor is to present one or at most two candi-

¹CIC, lib. III, pars I, titulus II, caput IV, cc. 793-797 incl.

²CIC, 793.

³Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, tome III, deuxième partie (Paris, 1910), livre xix, ch. ii, p. 942, n. 15; livre xx, ch. iv, p. 1142, n. 55; p. 1144, c. 31; tome iv, première partie (Paris, 1911), livre xxi, p. 68, n. 54.

praesentet, nisi aliud justa
de causa ministro videatur.

dates, unless the minister,
for a sound reason, judge
otherwise.

By means of this canon, the modern Church felicitously safeguards her age-old principle of a single candidate for each sponsor. At the same time, like a wise mother, she shows awareness of the pressing practical problems; hence she inserts the saving clause: "unless the minister, for a sound reason, judge otherwise."

By means of this canon, the Church hints that the sponsor, determined to perform his duties properly, will not be able to cope with more than a couple of godchildren.

Were the Church to abandon her principle, and to grant wholesale permission for block sponsorship, she would accelerate the unfortunate trend that regards sponsorship as an empty formality, stripped of all real significance; and that whittles down the spiritual relationship contracted by sponsor and godchild to a legal fiction. This danger is all the greater seeing that this spiritual relationship no longer (as in the past) constitutes a barrier to marriage.

If (as might well happen in some newly opened mission field) no sponsors at all are available for Confirmation, the Church wishes that those first confirmed should act as sponsors for those to follow. She thus shows her confidence in the sacredness of her own traditions, to which she steadfastly clings even when necessity dictates the acceptance of a weakened form.

The obligation to have a sponsor is a grave one. Nevertheless, Confirmation without a sponsor is valid. Moreover, if no sponsor can be had, it is even licit.⁴

In order to avoid block sponsorship which the Church at best tolerates under protest, and, at the same time, to meet the practical difficulties, Père Gérard Fransen has put forward the following ingenious suggestion⁵ which, however, may not win the approbation of everyone.

The Church expressly permits the use of a proxy.⁶ Fransen suggests that the many sponsors required when a large number of

⁴Genicot-Salsmans, *Institutiones Theologiae Moralis*, editio xiv; vol. II, n. 166. Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, London, 1935, vol. III, p. 77, sect. I.

⁵*La Maison-Dieu*, n. 54, p. 150.

⁶CIC, 795, n. 5: "Confirmandum in ipso confirmationis actu per se vel per procuratorem physice tangat."

candidates is to be confirmed might each appoint the same person as proxy.⁷ Or, to be more precise, all the women-sponsors might appoint one of themselves for the girls; and all the men, one of their number for the boys. The ceremony might then proceed in an orderly way; tradition and the sacred canons would be thoroughly respected; the highest ideals of sponsorship would be maintained, for each sponsor, for whom the proxy acted, would bear individual responsibility for his own confirmational godchild.

*

*

*

Just as one sponsor may not present many candidates, so each 'confirmandus' is to have one and only one sponsor.⁸ The Church, therefore, discountenances plurality of sponsors. In this matter she is stricter about Confirmation than about Baptism, where two godparents are explicitly allowed.⁹

*

*

*

The Church issues one set of regulations for the *validity*, and another for the *liceity* or *lawfulness*, of sponsorship.¹⁰ Their very existence is eloquent of the Church's care and concern for sponsorship.

A—For Validity:¹¹

(1) The sponsor must himself have been confirmed, must be in possession of his faculties and must deliberately intend to undertake the task of sponsor.

Comment—(a) The sponsor, unless he is himself confirmed and honestly striving to lead the sort of life expected from him, cannot possibly discharge his office of sponsor in the way the Church wants.

⁷Davis (op. cit. p. 78) notes: "If a sponsor wishes to act by proxy, he should appoint the proxy. The custom of leaving the appointment of the proxy to others, renders sponsorship doubtful."

⁸CIC, 794/2: "Unus quoque pro singulis confirmandis sit patrinus."

⁹CIC, 764.

¹⁰A thing is said to be *validly* done if one at least of its essential aims is achieved; and if it need not, therefore, be repeated. It is *licitly* or *lawfully* done if no law has been broken in the doing. What is unlawful or illicit is not, on that account, invalid. For example, Confirmation is validly conferred if all the essential conditions are duly observed in its administration: required minister, intention, matter, form; suitable subject. The sacrament is then genuinely given; its character is engraved on the soul. To attempt its repetition would be fraught with sacrilege (cf. D. 996). To confer a sacrament licitly one must make sure that, over and above the requirements for validity, no Church law has been contravened in its administration. For example, the chrism of Confirmation should be of this, not last, year's making.

¹¹CIC, 795.

(b) "... deliberately intend . . .": seeing that sponsorship involves important responsibilities, especially if the parents fail to do their duties, no God-fearing man will commit himself to it lightly and without mature consideration.

(2) The following are banned from being sponsors: inscribed members of heretical, schismatic or atheistic bodies; those under condemnatory or declaratory sentence of excommunication, legal infamy or of exclusion from specified ecclesiastical acts;¹²; defrocked clerics.

Comment—"condemnatory or declaratory sentence . . .": what causes sponsorship to be invalid is not excommunication, legal infamy or exclusion, but rather the formal, juridical pronouncing of sentence of any of these. Excommunications are fairly rare in the modern world; solemn proclamation of condemnatory or declaratory sentence is rarer still. Nevertheless it sometimes occurs. In the pontificate of Pius XII there was a celebrated instance: the enemies of Cardinal Mindszenty were, from the very fact of their grossly unjust attack on him, struck with excommunication. Pius XII confirmed this in the most impressive manner by formally declaring to the world their state of excommunication.

The difference between a declaratory and a condemnatory sentence is this: the former is a legal solemnity publishing an excommunication already incurred by the very fact that a crime has been committed by one who was aware of its being forbidden under pain of excommunication.¹³ A condemnatory sentence is one where a competent authority fulminates an excommunication¹⁴ or other penalty against a person for the crime he has committed. In other words, a declaratory sentence is passed on a person already excommunicated before the sentence is pronounced; a condemnatory sentence causes the person to be excommunicated or otherwise punished.

(3) Because of the spiritual relationship established by sponsorship, neither father nor mother, husband nor wife of the candidate may stand as sponsors.

(4) The sponsor is to be nominated by the candidate, or by

¹²*CIC*, 2256/2.

¹³"*Poena latae sententiae*"—*CIC*, 2217/2. Cf. Genicot-Salsmans, *op. cit.*, vol. II, n. 564.

¹⁴"*Poena ferendae sententiae*."

the latter's parents or guardians. Should these not be forthcoming, or should they refuse to act, then either the minister or the parish priest may select the sponsor.

Comment—The Church establishes a hierarchy of rights in the appointment of a sponsor. The candidate can claim first say. Then, in decreasing priority, parents, guardians, minister, parish priest. This provision is certainly practical; for, even Catholics of permanently unhinged mind should be confirmed.¹⁵

(5) Lastly, at the moment of Confirmation the sponsor, either personally or by proxy, must physically touch the candidate.

Comment—Today, the common method of achieving this bodily contact is by the sponsor's laying his right hand on the right shoulder of the 'confirmandus.' Such, however, has not always been the procedure. The *Pontificale Romanum* still contains this curious rubric:

Infantes per patrilinos ante Pontificem confirmare volentem teneantur in brachiis dextris.

Adulti vero, seu alii maiores ponant pedem suum super pedem dexterum patrini sui.

Et ideo, neque masculi feminis patrini, neque feminae masculis matrinae esse deberent.¹⁶

Babies are to be held on the sponsors' right arms before the bishop when he is ready to confirm them.

Grown-ups or all who are no longer babies-in-arms should place their foot on their sponsor's right foot.

This is why neither the godparent of a woman should be a man, nor that of a man, a woman.

(In parenthesis: the first clause of this rubric witnesses to the fact that the Western Church of the twentieth century formally recognizes infant-Confirmation, even outside the danger of death. Indeed, this practice is found both in Spain and in Latin America.)

This bizarre foot-ceremony, which is alleged as the reason why sponsor and godchild should be of the same sex, dates back to the Gregorian Sacramentary of the ninth century. Though stubbornly maintaining its position in the *Pontificale Romanum*, it has nevertheless become something of a fossil. As with the tap on the cheek, so here we have to do with an importation into

¹⁵Genicot-Salsmans, op. cit., n. 163.

¹⁶*Pontificale Romanum*, Marietti, Rome, 1941, p. 1. Cf. Similar rubric in the ceremony: "Confirmatio uni tantum conferenda," p. 3.

the Liturgy of Germanic provenance. In Germanic Law such a gesture was used to indicate a taking of possession, an assumption of rights. Apparently, then, in the Liturgy of Confirmation, this act is to be interpreted as typifying in some sort the responsibility of the sponsor, the title he acquires to a moral surveillance over his godchild,¹⁷ or, perhaps, the right acquired by the godchild to assistance from his sponsor.

*

*

*

B—For Liceity, the following conditions are prescribed:

(1) The confirmational sponsor must be other than the godparent in Baptism, unless the minister for a reasonable cause judge otherwise, or unless Confirmation is legitimately conferred straight after Baptism.

Comment—This demand for different sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation can find convincing support neither in the tradition of the ancient Church nor in modern theology. Nevertheless it is shored up by eight centuries of repetition by the Canonists. Gratian has it in his *Decretum* of 1140,¹⁸ it appears first in the ninth century in the Penitential of Theodore. According to Gérard Fransen,¹⁹ this custom owes its origin to an equivocation or a misunderstanding of a Latin phrase forbidding (outside cases of necessity) block sponsorship, whether at Baptism or at Confirmation.

However, this prescription has an interest which is chiefly archaeological, because in practice the minister can always authorise a departure from it on reasonable (not necessarily, grave) grounds.

(2) The sponsor is to be of the same sex as the candidate unless in special cases for a reasonable cause the minister judge otherwise.

Comment—We have already noted that the reason behind this clause is the now obsolete foot-ceremony. This, like the previous condition, is not a rigid requirement. The minister may fairly easily dispense with it.

¹⁷Righetti, *Storia Liturgica*, Milan, 1953, vol. IV, p. 104. Père Gy remarks: "Rubrique amusante héritée du pontifical romain-germanique et même des sacramentaires du 9^e siècle." He points out that on Sept. 20, 1749, the Sacred Congregation of Rites had replied to an Hungarian bishop that all the sponsor needed to do was to lay his right hand on the candidate's right shoulder. *La Maison-Dieu*, n. 58, p. 144.

¹⁸"De consecratione," dist. 4, c. 100.

¹⁹*La Maison-Dieu*, n. 54, pp. 151-153.

(3) The sponsor must have completed fourteen years, unless the minister has a sound reason for admitting someone younger.

Comment—Unless a person has reached a certain physical and mental maturity, he cannot be a suitable guide to help his newly-confirmed godchild in the way of life required by the Sacrament of supernatural maturity. Other things being equal, the more mature the sponsor, the better.

(4) The following persons are forbidden to assume the rôle of sponsors: those guilty of a notorious crime carrying with it excommunication, exclusion from legitimate ecclesiastical acts or legal infamy, even though in fact no sentence should have taken place; those who are under personal interdict; public sinners; those infamous in fact.²⁰

Comment—(a) A notorious crime is one that has become public property, having been committed in such circumstances that it can in no wise be hushed up or explained away—CIC 2197/3.

(b) A person guilty of a hidden crime such as abortion, which (despite the fact that it remains hidden) nevertheless carries with it excommunication, is not debarred from being sponsor.

(c) “Public sinners”: this phrase would include, for example, professional prostitutes. To have such persons as sponsors would be unseemly and against the reverence due to the sacrament. Moreover, they would not be fitted to perform the special task of sponsor.

(5) The sponsors must know the rudiments of the Faith.

Comment—This is a minimal requirement. The Church does not, of course, demand any academic qualifications in her sponsors. She realises that quite unlearned people might make admirable sponsors, provided they know enough about the Faith to be able to explain, if necessary, how the mature Christian should behave.

(6) Neither novices nor professed religious may act as sponsors, except in cases of necessity and then only with the express permission of at least the local Superior.

(7) Clerics in major Orders may not be sponsors unless they have the express permission of their own Ordinary.

²⁰CIC, 2293: Here legal infamy and infamy of fact are defined and contrasted.

Comment—The motive behind the prohibitions in 6 and 7 is the awkwardness, not to say the impossibility, for such dedicated persons to perform both the duties of their state and those attaching to the position of sponsor. Here once again the Church makes her mind perfectly plain: confirmational sponsorship is a serious business; it may be time-consuming; those who undertake it must be reasonably free in order to be able to discharge its responsibilities.

*

*

*

The last and quite the most important point about the sponsorship concerns the responsibility and the duties of the sponsor towards the new godchild. The relevant canon is terse and compressed:

Etiam ex valida confirmatione oritur inter confirmationem et patrinum cognatio spiritualis, ex qua patrinus obligatione tenetur confirmatum perpetuo sibi commendatum habere et eiusque christianam educationem curandi.²¹

Even from a valid Confirmation there arises a spiritual relationship between the confirmed and his sponsor, whereby the latter is bound by the obligation of regarding the confirmed as entrusted to his care forever, and of attending to his development as a Christian.

In the natural order, human birth into a particular family gives rise to a whole network of blood-relationships, more or less close: parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts, brothers, sisters, cousins. So in the supernatural order, spiritual relationships spring out of the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation. In the case of Baptism, the spiritual relationship contracted by the person baptised with the minister and the godparents is, like consanguinity, a diriment impediment to marriage. This, however, is no longer the case with Confirmation.

The canon before us asserts that from the bare fact of Confirmation's being validly administered there arises a spiritual relationship between the sponsor and his godchild. This is unaltered, whether or not all the requirements for liceity are fulfilled.

In this respect the spiritual relationship is similar to the sacramental character. Despite the recipient's of Confirmation

²¹CIC, 797.

being in the state of mortal sin, he can nevertheless be validly confirmed; consequently he can have the sacramental character eternally engraved on his soul. His sin does indeed throw up a barrier to grace, thus rendering the sacrament "unfruitful;" but sin, as such, is powerless to undermine the validity of the sacrament.²² Now, just as a merely valid sacrament will cause the character, so it will inevitably give rise to the spiritual relationship. This, of course, is 'a fortiori' caused when Confirmation is both licitly administered and fruitfully received.

Once established, the spiritual relationship becomes the source of a twofold obligation in the sponsor: that of looking upon his godchild as permanently confided to his care; that of watching over his Christian education, or (as I prefer to express it) of attending to his complete development as a Christian.

The obligations of sponsors are usually represented as conditional rather than absolute. That is to say, the sponsor is not always and everywhere burdened with responsibility for his godchild; he is so, only in the event of the parents defaulting. Plainly, by prior title and by divine law, the confirmed is entrusted to his own parents, on whom, consequently, is incumbent the obligation of ensuring a satisfactory Christian upbringing. When, therefore, the parents are well-informed and zealous Catholics, there may be little or nothing for the sponsor to do. In such circumstances, perhaps nothing in the way of strict obligation can be urged on the sponsor.

However, even in an ideal situation, the generous sponsor will do everything he can to reinforce the work of the parents in providing for the completest possible Christian development of the newly confirmed. The latter will be mightily helped if the precepts and example of his parents are supported and endorsed by his sponsor out of a genuine, Christlike interest in him.

It must be recognized that certain elements in confirmational

²²That the validity of the sacraments does not in principle hinge on the moral goodness of the minister is an article of faith defined by the Church against the Waldensians, Fraticelli, Wycliff, Hus and Luther. Of course, if the minister's sin bears on essentially interfering with the matter and form of the sacrament, or if it consists in a malicious withholding of minimal intention then the validity of the sacrament will be affected. The invalidity would then arise not from the nature of sin as such but from a lack of basic elements: matter or form or intention. Hence theologians use such phrases as: "sin as such . . .", "sin in principle . . .", "sin *per se* does not destroy the validity of the sacraments." Leeming (*Principles of Sacramental Theology*, London, 1955, Section V, Chapter 16, pp. 497-553), gives an ample treatment of this subject.

sponsorship are not just conditional but indeed absolute. Thus the spiritual relationship is an absolute; likewise the sponsor's duty of regarding the godchild as perpetually confided to him. One wonders how many sponsors have ever told themselves that the bond forged between them and their godchildren can be severed only by death. Sponsorship does not mean just a brief association of three or four hours: at a liturgical ceremony and then at a party that celebrates it and where the sponsor is accorded a privileged position. The relationship and the subsequent responsibility of caring for the godchild do not end with the schooling of this latter or with his attainment of his civic majority. The sponsor has contracted a lifelong duty and solicitude. At the moment his influence or counsel might hardly be needed. But there may well come a day when his intervention will prove decisive or, at least, highly beneficial.

By instituting confirmational sponsorship the Church has once again shown her motherly care for her children. God has appointed parents as the protectors and educators of their children; they form, as it were, the first line of defence. The Church, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, strengthens and reinforces this divine arrangement by surrounding the confirmed Christian with a second line of defence: his sponsor. When parents are loyal to their duties, the sponsor will tactfully aid and abet their endeavours. If, however, they fail, his role becomes capital: he will do his utmost to ensure that this parental failure does not prove fatal; he will do what he can to compensate for it, watching over the Christian formation of his charge.

If parents are not only themselves careless about their responsibilities, but also hostile towards any overtures from the sponsor, his position becomes extremely delicate and "craves wary walking." Sometimes his hands may be so tied that he cannot act at all. In that case, all strict obligation to intervene ceases, at least for the time being. Nevertheless, seeing that it was especially to meet such an eventuality that the Church established the rôle of sponsor, and, further, that it is precisely in such circumstances that his influence is most needed and can be most telling, he will cast about to show his practical concern for his godchild in some way.

*

*

*

What exactly is meant by the phrase: "christianam

educationem curandi" as it appears in the canon quoted above? One can seize the implications of this phrase only when one interprets it in the light of a just and adequate understanding of Confirmation itself.

It is worth while comparing and contrasting this canon (CIC 797) with its double—that concerning the responsibilities of the godparents of Baptism (CIC 769). There the godparents are also commanded to regard their godchildren as entrusted to their care forever. They are further enjoined carefully to watch that the godchildren are so brought up,²³ as to lead a life honouring their solemn baptismal pledges.

In general, we may conclude that just as the duty of the baptismal godparent is to urge the ideals of Baptism, so that of the confirmational sponsor is to urge those of Confirmation.

Consequently the duty of this latter will not be primarily or precisely that of ensuring that his godchild gets an elementary Catholic schooling. For, in default of the parents, that duty necessarily devolves on the godparents of Baptism.

Rather the duty of the sponsor of Confirmation is to watch over the Christian education of his charge in the larger sense of inducting him into the public life of the Church; of instructing, encouraging and inspiring him to act as an unselfish and fully-fledged member of the Church, one, therefore, who is alive to his duties of an adult Christian. The conscientious and knowledgeable sponsor will not be content if his godchild is merely the sort of Catholic who goes to Mass on Sundays and the Sacraments occasionally; but who does not bother himself to do much or anything not imposed under pain of mortal sin. The sponsor will want to see his charge go further; he will feel it his responsibility to instill into him lofty ideals of service of Christ and the Church; he will direct him to bear active and passive witness for the Church within the field of his opportunities.

Hence the "Christian education" of Canon 797 refers to the fuller development of a Christian, to his attaining the full stature of Christ. It involves making the godchild aware of his new status in the Mystical Body and of the consequent style of life imposed.

Perhaps the task of the sponsor of Confirmation bears some

²³"are so brought up"—the Latin is: "in iis quae ad christianae vitae institutionem spectant . . ." (CIC, 769).

likeness in the supernatural sphere to that of the wise and reliable adult in ordinary human affairs who is appointed to chaperon and advise, instruct and caution young people just finished at school and budding out as responsible citizens. Such older persons can be invaluable as guides, philosophers and friends—not only in the first awkward months, but throughout life, in all its major issues: friendship, marriage, career, triumphs or failures, bereavement or prosperity, social activity, public service.

If with these thoughts in mind we quietly re-read the provisions laid down for valid and lawful sponsorship, we shall detect in them a deeper significance; we shall sharpen our appreciation for the wisdom and sobriety of Holy Mother Church.

J. P. KENNY, S.J.

Canisius College, Pymble, N.S.W.

SHORT NOTICE

CHRISTIANITY AND AMERICAN FREEMASONRY, by William J. Whalen. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1958; 195 pages; price 38/6; indexed.

Some people cannot understand why the Church has continually warned her members against affiliating with the Masonic Lodge. This book was written to answer such a query. Mr. Whalen clearly sets down the Church's case against Masonry and shows conclusively its incompatibility with the teaching of the Church.

The author gives us a very thorough treatment of Masonry in America and of those societies affiliated with it. He outlines its origins and describes, with illustrations, its structure and initiating rites. He considers especially the oaths that the aspirant to the Lodge must swear and it is in these oaths that the Church finds many of its objections. The matter of anti-Catholicism in the Lodge is also discussed. In conclusion the author, in a chapter on Christianity and the Lodge, sums up the Church's case against the Lodge and in an appendix he gives the encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII on Masonry. Throughout the book Mr. Whalen has, as far as possible, let the Masons speak for themselves. He continually refers to masonic sources and gives a very good bibliography of these.

To those who wish to look into the secrets of Masonry this is a very helpful book. To those Masons who wish to know why the Church has continually condemned the Lodge here is the answer.

D.W.

Moral Theology

Dear Rev. Sir,

On the occasion of a wedding to be celebrated during the afternoon in the presence of a rather large number of friends, a priest asks the Bishop for the permission to celebrate Mass and give the nuptial blessing. It happens that the priest is also bound to celebrate in the morning to provide for the needs of the faithful who frequent daily Mass. Does the permission to celebrate the nuptial Mass in the afternoon include the faculty to binate on this particular day?

VICARIUS.

REPLY

Permission to celebrate an afternoon Mass does not automatically include the faculty to binate. Two distinct laws are involved in the case submitted: (1) the normal time for celebrating Mass is from an hour before dawn to an hour after mid-day (cf. can. 821, par. 1), and (2) a priest may offer Mass only once each day, except on Christmas Day and on the Commemoration of All Souls (can. 806, par. 1). The intervention of competent ecclesiastical authority is necessary for any departure from either of these prescriptions of law; and if both are to be set aside simultaneously, a two-fold act of authority is required.

Mass may be said during the hours of the *afternoon* only with the permission of the Ordinary, to the exclusion even of the Vicar General, unless he has a special mandate. The permission may be given for the spiritual good of a notable number of the faithful (cf. *Motu proprio Sacram Communionem*, March 19, 1957. A.A.S. vol. 49, pp. 177-178). While the bridal party themselves would not be a notable portion of the faithful, the attendance of a rather large number of friends would satisfy the conditions for the permission.

On *Sundays and Feasts of precept*, Mass may be said twice, with a faculty from the Ordinary, granted by virtue of can. 806, par. 2, to enable a notable part of the faithful to fulfil their obligation of assisting at Mass. This faculty is usually included among those listed in the *pagella facultatum*, which the Ordinaries of these countries issue to the clergy.

Mass may be celebrated by the same priest only *once* on *week days*, without an Apostolic Indult. Local Ordinaries in territories under the jurisdiction of the S. Congregation of Propaganda have the faculty:

Concedendi sacerdotibus ut bis vel ter Missam celebrare possint, si, iuxta prudens Ordinarii iudicium, notabilis partis fidelium bonum id postulat, servatis de caetero iure servandis.

It is a sound opinion that the Bishop may grant this faculty habitually, if he judges the conditions for its lawful use are generally verified, just as he habitually gives the faculty for bination on Sundays and Feasts of precept. On the other hand, he may decide that conditions in his diocese do not warrant the widespread concession of the faculty to binate on a week day. It is exclusively a matter for the prudent judgment of the Ordinary. But whether the faculty be given habitually or *per modum actus*, granted it must be, if the priest is to act lawfully when he says more than one Mass on the same day. Because the Ordinary has the power to grant a faculty, it does not follow that the priests *ipso facto* enjoy it.

It follows that the priest who thinks he has good reason for celebrating Mass in the afternoon, when he is already bound to Mass in the morning, must obtain a double permission from the Ordinary, who is the final arbiter as to whether both or only one of the permissions should be granted, or, indeed, whether either of them is justified.

Priests, who act contrary to the prescriptions of can. 806, par. 1, and presume to celebrate Mass more than once a day, are to be suspended from the celebration of Mass for a time determined by the Ordinary, with due regard to the circumstances of the case (can. 2321). The penalty is *ferendae sententiae*, and as the law has the word *praesumpserit*, it is to be inflicted only when there was nothing to extenuate the guilt.

CAR INSURANCE

Dear Rev. Sir,

A party of men were involved in a car accident. The actual driver of the car at the time of the accident was a competent but non-licensed driver. The accident was in no way due to drunkenness or negligence on the part of the driver. However, in his statement to the police, the owner, who held a driver's

licence, made a false declaration, and said he was driving the car at the time of the accident. May the owner, on the basis of the false statement, claim third party insurance for the injuries caused in the accident? If not, would he be bound to restitution?

SACERDOS.

REPLY

The consequence of a false statement made to the police officer is that a summons will not be issued against the driver for being in charge of a motor vehicle, whilst not duly licensed. It was morally wrong to make the false statement, as the police officer was entitled to examine the driver's licence. The desire to avoid prosecution for breaking the law is no excuse for a lie. However, the law which requires a driver to possess a current licence may be regarded as purely penal, in the case of a driver whose competency is beyond all doubt. If he breaks the law, he must take the consequences and be prepared to be charged with a violation of the traffic regulations. Because no legal action is taken in this case, the Treasury is possibly the poorer by the amount of the fine which would have been imposed; but as a fine is not due till sentence is passed, there is no violation of commutative justice and no obligation of restitution under this head.

In making a claim on the Insurance Company, the owner should have stated all the facts. Any payment made by the Insurance Company that would not have been granted, were the officials of the Company aware of all they had a right to know, would be obtained under false pretences, and is matter for restitution.

The natural law dictates that no one should drive a motor vehicle unless he is competent to do so. A person who cannot manage a car in the circumstances in which he intends to drive it, runs the risk of personal injury to himself and others, and is liable to cause serious damage to both public and private property. As a safeguard, and in the interests of the public good, the law requires that whoever proposes to take a vehicle on the public highway shall have first proved his skill in handling the vehicle to the satisfaction of the appropriate public official. No one will deny that this law is just and reasonable. We would hesitate, however, to say that it imposed a moral obligation absolutely on

one who would certainly pass the test required by the traffic authorities. For one who is not competent, the positive civil law is merely a declaration of the law of nature. It binds in conscience, the gravity of the obligation varying with the extent of the risk of damage involved. Any person, no matter how competent, who was charged with driving without a licence would be bound to pay the penalty, *post sententiam iudicis*.

If there were no question of a contract with an Insurance Company, the query could be left here; but the more serious aspect of the case is the attempt to obtain the benefit of the Insurance. The acceptance by the insured of a Policy issued by the Company constitutes a bi-lateral contract, binding both sides in commutative justice. When a car is insured, the Company undertakes certain risks in return for the payment of a premium. The premium is assessed after a survey of the risk involved, with due allowance for unforeseen circumstances. Seeing that considerable sums of money are likely to be called on for payment, the Company stipulates certain conditions to safeguard its own interests. These conditions are accepted by the insured and form part of the contract. Among the conditions is one that requires that the driver of the vehicle shall be legally qualified to be in charge of it. On private property, no licence is required by law, and a car would be covered by Insurance, even if the driver never held a licence. On a public road, no one may legally drive a car unless he has a licence, which is not issued unless he has shown his skill to the satisfaction of a traffic officer. The risk of injury or damage to a third party is obviously greater where others have equal access to the places where the car is driven. Although it may be true that many persons not in possession of a driver's licence are quite competent to drive, the Insurance Companies reasonably require that the driver be legally licensed. The possession of a current driver's licence would be *prima facie* evidence of the competence of the driver; its absence would throw the onus of proof on the driver that he was not undertaking risks which the Insurance Company never bargained for. After an accident, it may be difficult to establish this proof. A car which is driven in public by a non-licensed driver is not covered by Insurance, as the terms of the contract have not been observed.

After an accident, the Insurance Company will stand by its obligations and settle for any damages. Indeed, it is bound to do so,

by reason of the contract with the insured person, a contract which is enforceable by law. On the other hand, should the owner of the car not have kept all the conditions of the Policy, the Company is not bound in strict justice to pay anything. While Insurance Companies are not charitable organisations, they are usually managed by reasonable men, who make due allowance for the unforeseen emergencies of human associations. If all the facts of the case are placed before them, they will frequently suggest a settlement, to the mutual satisfaction of all parties. It is possible that the Company will make some payment, if it is satisfied that the conditions of the Policy were not flagrantly violated or the risk materially greater; but such payments would be rather in the nature of goodwill settlements not due in strict justice. The Insurance Company certainly has a right to know all the circumstances behind the claim made against it. Were the Management to discover that a false statement had been made with intent to defraud, it would be quite justified in taking legal action for the recovery of the monies paid, and might even lay a charge of conspiracy with intent to defraud against the owner and the actual driver, both of whom could find themselves in prison, as a deterrent to others who may be tempted to embark on similar illegal and dishonest acts. *Post sententiam iudicis*, the owner of the car would be bound to make any restitution ordered by the Court.

If we could reasonably presume that the Insurance Company would make some payment in a particular case, even had all the facts been presented to it, we would probably be justified in concluding that such an amount is not liable to restitution. What the Company most likely objects to is not so much the payment of some compensation, even though all the conditions of the contract were not observed to the letter, but that it was the object of an attempt to defraud. However, the difficulty is that we understand each case is judged on its merits before a claim for Insurance is met; and what would have been the decision of the Company with regard to this particular case we have no means of knowing. The only solution we can suggest is that a full statement of the whole case be submitted to some person well versed in the practices of Insurance Companies and be guided by his prudent decision. Taking the matter at face value, the Company has a right to full restitution for any amounts it has paid. The only

saving aspect is that it may not wish to demand its rights. It is for an Insurance expert to determine what would be the attitude of the Company with regard to the case submitted.

ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES AND FAMILY LIMITATION

Dear Rev. Sir,

A married woman had such difficulty in childbirth that her doctor warned her that future pregnancy would most likely be a serious danger to her life. She was aware that conception could be prevented by the use of certain devices, readily available; but as she was a conscientious woman, she refused to have anything to do with them. With the consent of her husband, conjugal relations were restricted to the periods, commonly known as "safe," when conception was thought to be improbable. Notwithstanding all precautions, she did become pregnant again, and her doctor's predictions proved only too true. Though she survived the ordeal, she does not feel inclined to face the same risk again. I have been asked if she could take advantage of a new drug, which has been mentioned, and is claimed to ensure that conception will not follow on conjugal relations, which are performed in the ordinary manner of nature. It seems that the new drug is only another device for frustrating nature, and should be condemned equally with contraceptive devices.

PASTOR.

REPLY

The query may be conveniently treated under the following headings:

1. Is it lawful for married couples to avoid having children?
2. Why is the use of contraceptive devices forbidden?
3. What is to be said of the morality of the "safe" period? How does this differ from the use of contraceptives?
4. If the use of the "safe" period be not against the natural law, would it be lawful to take drugs to induce a "safe" period?

At the outset, it may be said that it can be lawful for married couples to avoid having children, if there be sufficient reason for not undertaking the burden of a family. Given this

sufficient reason, it will be a question of the means employed to ensure the desired state of childlessness, or a limitation of the number of children in the family. The restriction of conjugal relations to the periods when the woman is naturally sterile is not against the laws of nature, but may be forbidden for other reasons. The use of contraceptive devices and the *coitus interruptus* are against the natural law. Likewise it is against the natural law to have recourse to drugs to produce sterility. Though the use of contraceptives to prevent the natural effect of conjugal relations and the taking of contraceptive drugs are both under condemnation, the reasons why they are so are not the same in both cases.

1. The primary purpose of marriage is to bring children into the world and to educate them as citizens of this world and ultimately as citizens of the kingdom of heaven hereafter. However, the object of the marriage contract is not to beget children, but mutual right to physical acts which are naturally destined to be the beginning of a series of cause and effect which, in favourable circumstances, will result in conception. A marriage which would exclude this right would be invalid. Normally, the married couple, urged by the promptings of nature directed by reason, would use their rights and become "two in one flesh." Thus they do all in their power to fulfil the divine injunction: "Increase and multiply and fill the earth" (Gen. 1:28).

Because of the contract that exists between man and wife, neither is entitled to deny conjugal rights to the other without very good reason; and to do so would be a violation of the marriage contract and a sin against the virtue of justice. According to the principle often quoted when dealing with questions of justice: *Scienti et volenti non fit iniuria*, husband and wife can mutually agree to forgo the use of marriage rights. They should not come to such an agreement, unless impelled thereto by weighty considerations. Apart from the danger of sin to which an attempt to observe continence may possibly expose them, the very reason for marriage is the good of the human race by its continuance, and married people have a duty to society to provide the members of the next generation. "Marriage binds to a state of life which, while conferring certain rights, at the same time imposes the accomplishment of a positive work which belongs to the very state of wedlock" (Pope Pius XII

Address to the Italian Congress of Catholic Midwives, 29th Oct., 1951, A.A.S. 43 (1951), p. 846). According to a general principle, invoked by the late Holy Father, serious reasons, often advanced on medical, eugenic, economic and social grounds, can exempt from the obligations of parenthood for a considerable period of time, even for the entire duration of the marriage. The principle invoked is that a positive duty may be withheld if there are grave reasons, independent of the good will of those under the obligation, to show that its fulfilment is untimely, or to make it evident that the duty cannot be fairly demanded by those who have the right to require it. In this case it is the human race who makes the demand, and sometimes for the reasons mentioned, the demand would be unfair, when all the circumstances are considered.

Many reasons can thus justify the desire of married couples not to have children or to take lawful precautions that the wife will not become pregnant again. The wife, in the case under discussion, surely has good reason to avoid future pregnancy. It would be an act of heroic virtue for her to expose herself to the danger of death at the next parturition. The practice of such virtue may be laudable in itself, but she cannot altogether overlook her responsibilities to her husband and to any children with which God has already blessed her. Surely society would not demand of her that she sacrifice her life, and leave her children as a burden on others. No one can take her place in the care of her family, and she has a duty to ensure that she will not needlessly deprive them of the protection that only their mother can give.

When husband and wife do not achieve the primary purpose of marriage, is it lawful for them to enjoy the secondary ends of marriage? The answer must be: Yes, provided they do nothing in the exercise of their conjugal relations which will be an impediment to the natural consequence of their actions. If they perform duly, and in accordance with nature, the acts to which they gave each other the right in the marriage contract, and for some natural cause, conception does not follow, they have done no evil. The actual conception is always beyond the control of the human will—it is an *actus naturae* not an *actus humanus*. There is no obligation to observe continence at times when it is unlikely or impossible, in the order of nature, that conception

will follow. Otherwise, there would be no remedy for concupiscence, and absolutely continence would be of obligation after the menopause, during the months of pregnancy, and for some time after child-birth, or, for that matter, during most of married life, since conception is possible only on a few days during each monthly female cycle.

2. Contraceptives are forbidden because they frustrate the marriage act, and make it no longer *aptus ad generandum*. The generative faculty was given to man for generative acts, which are destined primarily for the good of the whole human race, and only secondarily for the good of the individual, as a means to ensure that the race would continue, that men and women would be willing to have children and educate them as human beings. Solitary sin is admitted to be against the law of nature because it is sexual activity which of its very nature cannot lead to conception. Instead of seeking a partner with whom he can lawfully exercise the generative faculty, for the purpose which God intended, the person who acts in this manner finds satisfaction in himself. In the act of sodomy, satisfaction is sought with a partner of the same sex, and there is a perversion of the faculty, universally condemned as un-natural. Conjugal onanism, or so-called marriage relations, where the two obtain satisfaction, without becoming "one flesh" is also a violation of the law of nature. The parties to it are partners in self gratification, using exclusively for their own benefit what cannot, because of their intervention, be for the good of the race as a whole. They place artificial obstacles to ensure that nature will be deprived of the effects of their mutual relations. If nature herself does not provide for conception, it cannot be the fault of the couple; but if they prevent the course of nature they do a "detestable thing," and use the faculties God gave them in a manner contrary to the designs of the Creator. It is sin to lie, because a lie is a mis-use of the gift of speech which we have to communicate our thoughts to our neighbour, or at least to do our best in this regard; and it is a serious sin to deceive our neighbour by lies in a matter of grave import to himself or society. Is it not a greater sin for husband and wife to use the gift of procreation to deceive nature and deprive the human race of what should have been the fruits of their marriage?

3. Conjugal relations during the periods when conception is judged unlikely are not forbidden, as has already been mentioned. Restriction of the use of marriage rights to these times against the reasonable wish of one of the spouses is an act of injustice. With the willing consent of both parties, no injustice is done. If there be sufficient reason founded on "medical, eugenic, economic and social grounds," the use of the "safe period" can be justified.

There is all the difference in the world between onanism and the restriction of relations to the periods when conception is unlikely. In one case, violence is done to nature; in the other, advantage is taken of the laws of nature to obtain the secondary ends of marriage, when it would be unwise to seek the primary end. Partial abstinence, by mutual consent, may be easier than complete continence. The act performed between husband and wife is *aptus ad generandum*. Conception will not follow. The reason is not that some obstacle has been placed by the intervention of man, but because in the workings of nature, the conditions for conception are not present. Those who make use of the "safe period" to avoid having children may be reprehensible for other reasons, but they do not act un-naturally.

4. The use of the "safe period" as it occurs in the ordinary workings of nature is one thing, the induction of a "safe period" is quite another. It may be assumed that our correspondent has in mind a drug or "pill" recently featured in the news. According to the claims that have been made, the effect of the drug is to inhibit ovulation, and if ovulation does not take place, it is impossible for the woman to conceive. This effect would continue as long as the preparation was taken. In these circumstances, the woman could safely render the marriage debt without fear of becoming pregnant.

There can be no doubt that the use of the drug referred to for the purpose of preventing conception is gravely sinful. The objection to it does not come from any perversion of the act of intercourse, which remains an act *de se aptus ad generandum*. Its use is sinful because it directly brings about temporary sterility, an effect which it is not lawful to induce, except where the health of the woman concerned demands it, prescinding from all considerations of pregnancy. In other words, the claims made

for the publicised drug are that it causes what is equivalent in theological terms to a mutilation of the human body, which is not inflicted for the good of the whole body, but for quite other purposes.

The term "mutilation" includes not only the destruction or removal of an organ of the human body, but also the suppression of its functions. To remove an eye would obviously be a mutilation; to make it sightless would also be a mutilation. To remove the ovaries is drastic and evident mutilation; suppression of the functions of the ovaries may appear less abhorrent, but it is still an abuse of the rights over our bodies which we possess as human beings. We do not own ourselves nor any part of ourselves, we are God's creatures; and we are bound to preserve the integrity of our bodies, as we are bound to preserve our lives. If needs be, we may allow the removal or suppression of a member for the good of the whole body, according to the principle that the parts exist for the sake of the whole. A sick or diseased member may be excised or its functions suppressed. A healthy member may be suppressed or even removed if its functions cause damage to the whole body in certain pathological conditions. But it is not lawful to deprive ourselves of the possession or use of a member for any other purpose, for the simple reason that our bodies are not ours to dispose of. The more important the member, the greater the obligation to preserve it intact. Next to the members which are necessary for our individual existence, none have greater and higher functions in the scheme of divine Providence than the organs of reproduction, which are for the continuance of the human race. Although it may be conceded that the prohibition against mutilation can admit of *parvitas materiae*, there can scarcely be light matter when it is a question of suppressing the functions of the organs which have such a special and important purpose. Sterilisation of either man or woman is not lawful as a means to avoid children. The morality of the act of sterilisation by surgical intervention or of sterilisation by drugs, administered orally or otherwise, is the same. In each case, unless the health of the individual, considered as an individual, calls for it, it is an unwarranted interference with the integrity of the human body. A surgical operation usually produces permanent sterility; the taking of contraceptive drugs inhibits ovulation and causes sterility only for a time. The difference in the duration of the

effect does not change the moral species of the act that directly caused it.

In support of this position, we may draw attention to a decree of the Holy Office, 24th February, 1940. To the question: "Is sterilisation, whether temporary or permanent, of either man or woman, lawful?" the answer was: "No: and indeed it is forbidden by the natural law. The question of eugenic sterilisation has already been determined and condemned by a decree of this Supreme Congregation, 21st March, 1931, etc." (A.A.S. 31 (1940), p. 118)

The conclusion is that it is not lawful to take drugs to induce a period of sterility as a means to avoid children. Of course, their use may be lawful to correct some serious pathological state, even though, per accidens, temporary sterility were to result.

Note: There are other kinds of oral contraceptives, which are more obviously immoral. It is claimed that one type will interfere with the development of the ovum after fertilisation. This would be equivalent to the killing of the embryo. Another drug will bring about a condition of the cervical plug of mucus or the vaginal secretions which will not allow the sperm to survive. Its use would not differ essentially from any other means of destroying the sperm after conjugal relations.

The moral aspect of the use of oral contraceptives has been well stated by Dr. John Marshall in a recent excellent work: "The Ethics of Medical Practice" (Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1960). "It is clear . . . that these recent biological developments, which will undoubtedly progress and will revolutionise the methods of contraception, are morally wrong. Nor is it possible to envisage the development of any type of oral drug for the control of fertility which will not be morally wrong. All must be contraceptive, sterilising or feticidal in their action, hence all must be wrong" (page 85).

MISSA PRO POPULO

By decree of the S. Congregation of the Council, under the direction of the Supreme Pontiff, Pope John XXIII (Dec. 3, 1960), the days on which Residential Bishops and Parish Priests are bound to apply the Mass for their people have been brought into line with the new Rubrics. The list is as follows:

- A. All Sundays, whether first or second class.
- B. The Holy Days of obligation in the Universal Church: Christmas, the Octave of Christmas, the Epiphany, the Ascension, Corpus Christi, the Immaculate Conception of the B. Virgin Mary, the Assumption of the B. Virgin Mary, the Feast of St. Joseph, Spouse of the B. Virgin Mary, the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul, and the Feast of All Saints.
This group remains unchanged.
- C. First Class Feasts on the Calendar of the Universal Church: The Feast of the Sacred Heart (new), the Feast of the Most Precious Blood (new), the Annunciation of the B. Virgin Mary, the Feast of St. Joseph the Worker (new), the Dedication of St. Michael the Archangel, and the Nativity of St. John the Baptist.
- D. First Class Feasts on Special Calendars:
Feast of the principal Patron of the Nation (Our Lady Help of Christians), the Feast of a principal Patron of a Region or Province, whether ecclesiastical or civil (does not apply), the Feast of the Diocesan Patron (applies in those Dioceses where there is a duly constituted Patron), the Anniversary of the Dedication of a Cathedral (new—does not apply if the Cathedral is not solemnly consecrated), Feast of the Principal Patron of the Locality, City or Town (does not apply), the Anniversary of the Dedication of a Church (new—applies to the parish priest whose parish church is solemnly consecrated) and the Feast of the local church, i.e., the Titular of the Church (new—applies to each parish priest for his own church).
- E. Second Class Feasts:
The Nativity of the B. Virgin Mary, the Purification of the B. Virgin Mary, the Anniversaries of the Apostles and Evangelists, namely: St. Andrew, St. Thomas, St. John, St. Matthias, St. Mark (new), SS. Philip and James, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Luke (new) and SS. Simon and Jude.

It will be noted that the following days did not formerly carry the obligation of the *Missa pro populo*:

1. The feast of the Sacred Heart, 2. the Feast of the Most

Precious Blood, 3. the Feast of St. Joseph the Worker, 4. the Anniversary of the Dedication of a Cathedral, 5. the Anniversary of the Consecration of the Parish Church, 6. the Feast of the Titular of the Parish Church, 7. the Feast of St. Mark, and 8. the Feast of St. Luke.

The following days are no longer on the list:

1 and 2. Monday and Tuesday after Easter, 3 and 4. Monday and Tuesday after Pentecost, 5. the Feast of the Finding of the Cross (which has been suppressed), 6. the Feast of St. Stephen the first martyr, 7. the Feast of the Holy Innocents, 8. the Feast of St. Silvester (reduced to a commemoration), 9. the Feast of St. Lawrence the Deacon, 10. the Feast of St. Anne, Mother of the B. Virgin Mary.

For practical purposes, eight days have been added, while ten days have been taken from the list of days on which irremovable pastors are bound to apply the Mass for their people. The rule for removable pastors remains unchanged.

This decree came into force on January 1, 1961.

JAMES MADDEN.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Canon Law

THE PROMISE CONCERNING THE CATHOLIC EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN OF MIXED MARRIAGES

Dear Rev. Sir,

Before a Mixed Marriage may be permitted to take place it is required that both parties to the marriage should make certain promises. One of those promises is that all children who may be born of the marriage should be baptized and educated in the Catholic Religion. Does this promise mean that the parties have an obligation to send the children of the marriage to a Catholic school?

JOANNES.

REPLY

Canon 1061 of the Code of Canon Law states that the Church does not grant a dispensation from the impediment of Mixed Religion unless certain specified conditions are fulfilled; and canon 1071 extends this ruling to the impediment of Disparity of Cult. These conditions, therefore, apply in the case of all marriages between a Catholic and a non-Catholic, whether the non-Catholic party is baptized or not. The query of our correspondent is concerned with the second of the three conditions set down in canon 1061. The relevant section of the canon for our purpose, therefore, reads as follows: "§1. The Church does not dispense from the impediment of Mixed Religion unless . . . 2° the non-Catholic party gives a guarantee that the danger of perversion for the Catholic party will be removed, and both parties promise that all the children will be baptized and educated only in the Catholic Religion." As the canon stands, therefore, it is true that it does not explicitly state that there is an obligation on the parties to a Mixed Marriage to send the children to a Catholic school, nor does the canon explicitly state in so many words that the parties to such a marriage must promise to send any children of the marriage to a Catholic school. Hence, simply viewing the canon as it stands, it seems that on the face of it our correspondent has some justification for proposing his query.

It seems to us that in the discussion of our correspondent's query a fundamental position is occupied by canon 1374; and

hence, since in consequence this canon will be very prominent in the following pages, it will be well to quote it in full here. This canon states: "Catholic children shall not attend non-Catholic schools, neutral schools, or mixed schools, that is, schools which are open also to non-Catholics. It belongs to the local Ordinary alone to determine, in accordance with the instructions of the Apostolic See, in what circumstances and with what safeguards to avoid the danger of perversion attendance at such schools (by Catholic children) may be tolerated."

It is, of course, a matter of natural law that parents should endeavour to ensure and promote the religious education of their children; and this obligation is recalled in canon 1113, which states: "Parents are bound by a very grave obligation to provide to the best of their power for the religious and moral education of their children and their physical and civil education, and also to provide for their temporal welfare." It may be said that fundamentally the duty of Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools derives ultimately from this natural obligation, since in ordinary circumstances that obligation will best be fulfilled through the religious education to be received at a Catholic school. But, at the same time, it would be going too far to urge that this norm is absolute in the sense that no exception can be admitted under any circumstances. Hence, it may be affirmed that the theme of canon 1374, namely, that Catholic children ordinarily should attend Catholic schools, is derived from this natural obligation of parents to secure to the best of their power the religious education of their children and from the possibility that exceptional circumstances can sometimes create a situation in which this obligation will be fulfilled without attendance by the children at a Catholic school.

The preceding remarks are of a rather general nature, but they are sufficient to indicate the truth of our previous observation that canon 1374 occupies a position of fundamental importance in relation to our correspondent's query. Thus, the way is now prepared for certain observations about this canon which contain conclusions of the utmost importance to the query which has been submitted:

(1) Canon 1374 does not contain any express and positive precept that Catholic parents are bound to send their children to Catholic schools.

(2) However, it is clear from canon 1374 that if the children are to attend schools at all they are to be sent to Catholic schools; since other kinds of schools are eliminated either by the very nature of things (as in the case of schools that are anti-religious or that impart a religious instruction opposed to Catholicism) or by the other prohibitions contained in canon 1374, which exclude neutral schools (which do not seek to propagate or oppose religion but prescind from it altogether) and mixed schools (which admit pupils of any religion, no matter what it may be, or of no religion whatsoever, and impart a rather limited and general kind of Christian instruction).

(3) It follows from the two preceding observations, and is actually confirmed in canon 1374 itself, that it is possible to receive a Catholic education without actual attendance at a Catholic school, or, in other words, that actual attendance at a Catholic school—which ordinarily should be verified—is not so essential to a Catholic upbringing that it is not possible to have the one without the other. However, it is also clear from the nature of things and is expressly confirmed by canon 1374 that, where the two are legitimately separated, special precautions must be taken against the danger of perversion.

Consequently, it seems to us that canon 1374 makes it clear that there is a definite obligation to send the children to a Catholic school whenever there is question at all of attendance at school. However, the same canon also makes it clear that exceptional circumstances may render permissible the attendance of Catholic children at non-Catholic schools. Canon 1374 itself is content to leave to the local Ordinary the responsibility of determining when such attendance is permissible, and it does not indicate in any way the kind of circumstances that could justify a departure from the procedure that will ordinarily be required. In point of fact, however, it is not too difficult to find examples of such exceptional and justifying circumstances. Thus, for example, in country districts especially it may be a grave inconvenience, or even an impossibility, to send Catholic children to a Catholic school on account of the distance involved or even the complete absence of such schools. Or it could even happen, and in fact is actually happening, that at least in some places the existing Catholic schools are not able to accommodate all the Catholic children who in ordinary circumstances should attend and would

attend those schools. Or again, it is possible that some special situation may arise in a particular case which could justify the presence of Catholic children in a non-Catholic school with the usual precautions.

The point is that by way of exception such attendance of Catholic children at non-Catholic schools may be justified; and in confirmation of this fact and with exceptional circumstances of the nature we have suggested in mind the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office itself, in relation to the justification of the presence of Catholic children in non-Catholic schools, has stated in an Instruction: "It will usually be a sufficient reason if there is either no Catholic school at all available, or only one which is inadequate for the suitable education of the children according to their condition. In that case, in order that the public school may be attended with a safe conscience, the danger of perversion which is always more or less connected with its very nature must, by appropriate remedies and safeguards, be rendered remote" (24th November, 1875). In accordance with the doctrine set down above and the contents of canon 1374, the statutes of the Diocesan Synod of Sydney of 27th December, 1951, refer to the attendance of Catholic children at non-Catholic schools as being permissible by way of exception, namely, when grave circumstances exist to justify it and adequate precautions are taken against the danger of perversion (cfr. Statute n. 58 and Appendix V, n. 6).

While, therefore, absolutely speaking, a child may be educated as a Catholic independently of attendance at any school, Catholic or otherwise, and while, therefore, it would be possible to educate children as Catholics whether they attend a non-Catholic school or no school at all, it seems to us that from the preceding explanations the following conclusions relevant to our correspondent's query may legitimately be drawn:

(1) The promise that is required by canon 1061, §1, 2° is to be understood as implying an obligation to send any children of mixed marriages to a Catholic school if such is available.

(2) The fact that it may subsequently become impossible, or gravely inconvenient, to send a child of a mixed marriage to a Catholic school need not enter into consideration when the promise is actually being made. Without doubt the promise implies an obligation to provide a Catholic education, and in

turn—as we have now pointed out—this implies subsequent attendance at a Catholic school where it is available, as ordinarily it will be. It will be sufficient that the promise should be made with these dispositions. Subsequently it will be determined by the very nature of the case, for example, if there should be no Catholic school at all, or by the local Ordinary whether the circumstances are such as to permit the attendance of the children at a non-Catholic school; and if so, this may then be permitted without detracting in any degree from the promise made on the occasion of the marriage, for this promise will continue to be observed to the fullest degree that the circumstances permit, since in our hypothesis the Catholic education of the children thus deprived of actual Catholic schooling will be promoted in other lawful ways and precautions will be taken against the danger of perversion.

(3) If at the time of the giving of the promise there is an evident intention to send any children to a non-Catholic school, whether a Catholic school is available or not, but otherwise to permit them to be brought up as Catholics, it might still be possible that the local Ordinary would grant the dispensation for the marriage. For, as we have seen, it is possible to have a Catholic education without attendance at a Catholic school; these two factors are not inseparably united. But it would be for the local Ordinary to judge in the particular case whether the circumstances were such as to justify this departure from the normal requirement and obligation. It goes without saying, therefore, that the local Ordinary should be informed of this intention when the application for the dispensation is submitted to him, with a full account of the motives behind the intention and of all relevant details and indications.

In regard to this last hypothesis it will be relevant to recall that canon 1061, §1, 3° states that one of the requisites for the validity of a dispensation for a mixed marriage is that there should exist moral certainty that the promises will be observed. This moral certainty must exist on the part of him who is to grant the dispensation. In our conditions, therefore, this moral certainty must exist on the part of the local Ordinary who grants these dispensations by virtue of the special faculties given to him by the Holy See. If, in the kind of case we are envisaging in this third hypothesis, the local Ordinary judges that, notwithstanding

any explanations concerning motives and other relevant details, the intention of not sending any children of the marriage to a Catholic school is sufficient to impede him from attaining the requisite moral certitude regarding the fulfilment of the promises, he is not only justified in refusing to grant the dispensation but he would really be obliged to refuse it, because one of the indispensable requisites for the validity of the dispensation would be lacking, namely, moral certainty regarding the fulfilment of the guarantees. And it would not be difficult to appreciate that this would be his state of mind in the case where this definite intention existed even though it was foreseen that there would be convenient Catholic schools and no other legitimate impediment to attendance at such schools existed.

Moreover, in any case, the local Ordinary would have to keep in mind the ruling of canon 1374 that Catholic children should not attend non-Catholic schools; and he could scarcely grant a dispensation that would in fact run counter to this rule unless extremely good reasons—as demanded by that same canon—existed to justify such a departure. If, however, the local Ordinary were to decide before the marriage that exceptional circumstances existed to justify attendance at a non-Catholic school, that all necessary precautions would be taken against the danger of perversion, and that there was no malice on the part of the dissentient, he might feel that, all things considered, he could have moral certitude concerning the fulfilment of the promises and that sufficient reason existed to enable him to exercise the discretionary power given him by canon 1374 to dispense from the ordinary obligation of that canon.

G. C. GALLEN.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Liturgy

LAUDS

The new rubrics allow the anticipation of matins, but not of lauds, the latter is to be said *primo mane*. These new arrangements have naturally given rise to a number of questions. What about the age-old idea that matins and lauds should not be separated? Would not prime have been a more obvious choice for morning prayer? In view of the faculty that we have from the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda allowing us to anticipate both hours, is it thereby recommended that we continue to do so?

PRINCIPLES

As a background to our discussion we should bear in mind the basic principle enunciated in rubric 142: 'The Canonical Hours of the Divine Office are arranged, of their nature, to sanctify the different hours of the natural day.' St. Luke has recorded the teaching of our divine Master on the need for constant prayer: 'And he told them a parable, shewing them that they ought to pray continually, and never be discouraged' (xviii. 1); 'Keep watch, then, praying at all times, so that you may be found worthy to come safe through all that lies before you, and stand erect to meet the presence of the Son of Man' (xxi. 36). St. Paul repeated these injunctions of Christ (cfr. Rom. xii. 12; Col. iv. 2; I Thess. v. 17; Heb. xiii. 15). The writings of the early Fathers supply evidence of the manner in which these principles were put into practice by the ordinary faithful, and in a later age the anchorites of the desert and the monks were in an even better position to 'keep watch and pray at all times.'

The Divine Office, as we know it, is heir to two traditions. On the one hand is the tradition of cathedrals and churches, which from an early date observed regularly a morning and an evening prayer. On the other hand, we have the monastic tradition, which had a much fuller round of offices distributed throughout the day and night.

In the fourth century, Eusebius of Caesarea tells us that the praises of God were sung in the churches throughout the whole world in the morning and the evening (cfr. PG. 23, 639). Likewise, according to St. Augustine, St. Monica never failed to go to the

church each morning and evening (cfr. *Confessions*, V. 9). This public prayer in the morning and evening was the forerunner of our offices of lauds and vespers. The other hours, i.e., matins, prime, terce, sext, none and compline are, therefore, of monastic origin. Any evidence of a full round of the daily Office in churches other than cathedrals and monastic basilicas seems to be lacking before the 8th century. The office of a particular church at that time consisted of the celebration of some Hours each day in certain sanctuaries, whereas the other Hours were reserved for Sundays and feasts. Some of these offices were sung by the local clergy, others by those of neighbouring churches, which generally took it in turn. Clerics of all ranks, from the bishop to the door-keeper, were obliged to take part in these services according to their rank. None of them did, nor could have, celebrated the whole Office when it was distributed in this fashion (cfr. Salmon, *L'Office Divin*, Paris, 1959, p. 24; 206). It was only in the eighth century that clerics began to recite the whole Office each day. The movement which brought this about is associated with the names of St. Boniface and St. Chrodegang of Metz. The same movement sought to restore the common life for clerics which would make possible the discharge of this obligation at the proper times throughout the day. The conclusion to which these traditions lead us is, then, that the division of the Office into the Canonical Hours has for its purpose the sanctification of the various hours of the day. The very real and practical difficulties that arose in subsequent ages, when circumstances of clerical life changed completely while the personal obligation remained, should not allow us to lose sight of the true nature of the Church's daily prayer.

Having declared the nature of the Canonical Hours, the same rubric (n. 142) goes on to say: 'Accordingly, it is conducive to the genuine sanctification of the day and to the recitation of the Hours with spiritual profit, if they are discharged at the times which closely correspond to the true time for each of the Canonical Hours.' The Church has entrusted the priest with the task 'of praying in the name of the people and of consecrating to God the whole course of time and events' (Pope Pius XII, *Menti nostrae*, ECTS trans. n. 37). 'It is as though Christ himself were speaking, imploring through his minister from his loving Father the benefits of redemption; Christ, giving God due glory, in union with the hosts of angels and saints in heaven, and the multitudes

of Christians on earth; Jesus Christ, our Advocate, whose words bestow on us the immense treasures of his merits' (ibid. nn. 37, 40). Within the limits of possibility the priest should strive to discharge this sacred trust faithfully. Furthermore, greater spiritual profit may be gained from reciting the Hours in this way. We may at times underestimate the truth of which Pope Pius XII reminded us: 'The Divine Office is a powerful means of sanctification. The Office is not merely the recitation of formulae, nor a collection of hymns composed with literary skill, nor, again, the observance of certain rules called rubrics or of the outward ceremonies of worship. Rather, it is the raising of our mind and heart to God in union with the Blessed who sing His praises for ever' (ibid. n. 39). Applying these principles, the new rubrics propose lauds as the morning prayer, vespers the afternoon prayer and compline the night prayer.

THE NEW LAW

Matins, for a just reason, may be anticipated in the afternoon of the preceding day, but not before 2 p.m. (144).

Lauds, since they are morning prayer, are said *primo mane in choir* and *in common*; and it is appropriate to keep to this also in reciting them *alone* (145).

The Sacred Congregation of Rites has issued a declaration on these two rubrics.

'Since a doubt has arisen concerning the interpretation of nos. 144 and 145 of the new Code of rubrics, namely as to whether, after January 1, 1961, lauds may still be anticipated from the afternoon of the previous day when recited *alone*, this S. Congregation of Rites, in order to remove any uncertainty in a matter which pertains directly to the public prayer of the Church, has deemed it necessary to make the following declaration:

(1) No. 144 directly and exclusively allows the anticipation of matins either *in choir* or *in common*, or *alone*;

(2) No. 145 directly and exclusively determines that lauds may be recited *in choir* and *in common* only *primo mane*; i.e. they may never be anticipated; when recited *alone*, likewise they may not be anticipated, and are appropriately said at the same time in the morning. Rome, December 28, 1960.' (Published in *L'Osservatore Romano*, December 30, 1960; cfr. *Ephem. liturg.* 1961, p. 56).

In a previous number of the A.C.R. (October, 1960, pp. 330-331) doubt was expressed about the availability of the faculty granted by the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda allowing the anticipation of both matins *and* lauds. It has since been officially declared that the faculty has not been revoked, hence Ordinaries who enjoy this faculty may still allow their priests to anticipate lauds,¹ when recited *alone*, not *in choir* or *in common*. Another matter that might be mentioned in passing is that the privilege which priests have in this country of omitting matins and lauds when they say two Masses in different churches on Sundays and holydays of obligation is still valid (cfr. A.C.R., 1959, pp. 131-132).

MATINS AND LAUDS

There seems to be general agreement amongst authors that lauds have derived from the morning prayer which was observed in public churches from very early times. The proper time for the hour is *primo mane*, just before sunrise. It is the Hour which consecrates the beginning of the new day.

The precise origin of matins is not nearly so clear. The position is summarized by Jungmann thus: 'It is probable that we should regard matins, the most extensive Hour of the Office, as the continuation and development by monasticism of that form of prayer which was originally recommended to the faithful for the hour of midnight. It is certain that matins cannot be derived from the full Vigil which used to be held in ancient times by the entire Christian community; for the Vigil has quite a different form, and it was held—and could only be held—on certain days of the year. It is also certain at least that monks in very early times developed the private midnight prayers into a communal prayer service. . . . On the other hand it is not so certain that matins of the Roman Breviary originated in this way; and the question arises as to whether matins should not rather be regarded as a long introduction to the morning Hour, which we call lauds' (*Public Worship*, London, 1957, p. 169). Whatever about the historical origin of the relationship between the two Hours, the old rubrics forbade the separation of matins and lauds in choral recitation of the Office, but they did permit it when the two Hours were recited privately.

What is the significance of the new legislation? It would seem

¹Granted by the Pope, January 17, 1961 (cfr. *Periodica*, 1961, p. 42.)

that its purpose is to restore lauds to their proper time, namely to make them the morning prayer, consecrating the beginning of the new day. This is in keeping with the principles enunciated in rubric n. 142, which were discussed above. The ancient and public character of this Hour lends support to this norm. The monastic origin of matins places them in a rather different category. Likely enough, the practical difficulties associated with the recitation of both Hours first thing in the morning would also have been a major consideration in preparing the new rubric.

LAUDS IN PREFERENCE TO PRIME

Prime, as terce, sext and none, is of monastic origin. According to Cassian (+ c. 435) prime comes from the monastic observance in Jerusalem, and was introduced to prevent the lazier members of the community retiring to bed after lauds and remaining there until terce. However, it has been suggested that while Cassian's statement may be true of the situation in Bethlehem, it is hardly sufficient to explain the wide diffusion of prime as a regular office. More likely, the origin of prime is to be found in the almost spontaneous desire to fill the long period of time between lauds and terce (cfr. Raffa, *La Liturgia delle Ore*, Brescia, 1959, p. 80). However, the main point to be retained is that prime is a monastic hour, whereas lauds is the traditional morning prayer of the Church, which was observed not only in monasteries but also in cathedrals and public churches.

The monastic origin of prime is still reflected in the structure of the Hour as we recite it in the Roman Breviary. It is made up of two parts: the *officium chori*, the first part, i.e., psalms, &c., concludes with the prayer *Domine, Deus omnipotens*, and was destined to sanctify that particular hour of the day; the *officium capituli*, the second part, began with the reading of the martyrology, followed by the prayer for God's blessing on the day's work, the reading and explanation of the rule, and finally the blessing.

It is scarcely necessary to add that while the Church has declared her preference for lauds as the morning prayer of all who recite the Divine Office, she does not intend to belittle the value of prime as a prayer for the morning before commencing the day's work.

ANTICIPATION OF LAUDS

The practice of anticipating matins and lauds has usually

been recommended to priests as an ideal for their rule of life. We have already noted that the Australian Bishops have the faculty from the Congregation of Propaganda to allow their priests to anticipate lauds. The question is: May we still regard it as the ideal to use the faculty and continue to anticipate lauds. Leaving aside the peculiar circumstances in which individual priests may be placed, it seems certain that the anticipation of lauds can be no longer regarded as the ideal which all should strive to realize. The Church has declared her mind very explicitly, and the special concessions which she does grant reveal her willingness to take account of the variety of conditions under which her priests have to work. Let each one judge for himself, and in doing so let him not be unduly influenced by habit based on an ideal which the Church herself has modified to some extent.

It may not be fanciful to conjecture that part of our difficulty arises from the content of the Hour. Lauds do not appeal to us as 'morning prayer'. Some words of Father Roguet, O.P., may help to bridge the gap:

'Whatever of the value of the psalms as personal prayer, we risk being deceived if we look for something in them that is not there, namely a methodical prayer, systematic "acts" of virtue, spiritual elevations in the style of the *devotio moderna*. . . . Anyone who pretends that the priest ought to find everything that he needs in the Office is making a big mistake.

'The Office does not give us a complete spiritual culture. It gives us at least what is primary, and too often forgotten: praise, theocentric prayer, self-effacement. The main object of these is neither the conquest of virtue nor even the intercession of the apostles, but enthusiastic contemplation of God's transcendence. His plan for the universe, the grandeur of Christ and the riches of the Church.

'If we have no taste for the psalms, if we find them monotonous, lacking in psychological refinement and theological depth, let us be on our guard. The reason is that we do not understand the significance of *Sursum corda* and *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro*. Our religion is, perhaps, too humanistic and too utilitarian. Let us join the school of praise and adoration. This is not a luxury reserved for poets. Apart from its incomparable religious value, it has an extraordinary ascetical and purifying value. Is there any better way of forgetting self, of

practising self-effacement, than by giving first place in our prayers to solicitude for the praise of God's holiness?' (*Maison Dieu*, 21, pp. 160-161).

THE PSALMS OF LAUDS

Before concluding, a word about the psalms of lauds. The order of the psalms at lauds was formerly more fixed than at present. The Hour began with psalm 50, except on Sundays when it was replaced by 92; the second psalm was variable and chosen from psalms 99, 5, 42, 64, 89, 142 and 91; psalms 62 and 66 were joined in the third place; a canticle of the Old Testament was then said, and finally the three psalms 148, 149, 150, from which the name of the Hour was derived.

The reform of the psalter by St. Pius X introduced a greater variety of psalms and Old Testament canticles for lauds, but retained the principle of selection of psalms appropriate to morning prayer, psalms of praise and thanksgiving. The number was reduced to five.

In our present psalter the first psalm (92, 46, 95, 96, 97, 98, 149) has a common theme: *Dominus rex*. The variable psalms of the old schema have been retained as the second psalm in the revision, and the third psalm has been chosen from psalms 62, 28, 66, 100, 35, 84, 63. The theme of these two psalms is in keeping with the general theme of the Hour, and often selected because of some reference to 'morning' in the psalm. As the fourth psalm a canticle of the Old Testament has been chosen. This, too, follows the older practice, but the reform of Pius X increased the number of canticles available in both sets of psalms for each day of the week. The appropriateness of these canticles is self-evident. A series of psalms beginning with *Laudate* (148, 116, 134, 145, 146, 147, 150) continue the traditional theme for the concluding psalms of lauds.

An awareness of the general pattern followed in selecting the psalms of lauds should help us in reciting the Hour.

P. L. MURPHY.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Homiletics

THE WORDS UPON THE CROSS

Death is the common destiny awaiting all men and the inspired author of the book of Genesis does his best to show how death descended upon mankind. In spite of the controversial nature of the sacred text it is clear that death came to Adam against a background of self interest and disregard for God's Will. Perhaps it is for this reason that in the providence of God the inspired authors of the Gospels record so unobtrusively yet so graphically the circumstances connected with the death of the second Adam, Jesus Christ. From a study of the Gospels it would seem that we are able to reconstruct the human reactions of Christ as His death approaches more accurately than is possible for any other event in His life. And as the few immortal words placed on the lips of Adam in the book of Genesis bespeak the imminence of God's imposition of the death penalty so the "seven" unforgettable last words of Christ depict in an extraordinarily minute manner His condition and attitude before the common penalty for men claimed Him. In fact these "seven words" seem to portray these last hours on the cross not only as the most human of His life but also as a supreme manifestation of His interest in others and His respect for the Will of His Father—a complete reversal of and answer to the otherwise human conduct of Adam.

Elsewhere in the Gospels we are often compelled to look to the diffusiveness of Mark for precious human detail but here strangely enough we hardly need Mark's assistance since Matthew repeats Mark's contribution with "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me." It is Luke and John that are the main contributors to this verbal scene. Luke gives us the three "words": "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;" "Amen, I say to thee, this day thou shalt be with me in paradise;" "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit"—all of which words breathe the gracious character of the rest of the third Gospel. John also gives us three "words": "Woman, behold thy son—Behold thy mother;" "I thirst;" "It is consummated"—expressions reminiscent of the Roman Trial scenes in the fourth Gospel.

"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" can be reasonably taken as Christ's first utterance on the cross. The terrible significance of the phrase "what they do" is then all the more apparent as it no doubt suggests that the actual

work of placing the victim on the cross was still in operation. As the Roman soldiers worked, the words were addressed through them to the leaders of the Jewish race. This was Christ's last thought for those among whom He had worked and spent His short life. It seems therefore that at his point death was as yet not so close and therefore Christ's "vision" and interest could still reach beyond His deathbed to the little world of Judaism in which He had lived. Then comes the second utterance—Christ's acceptance of the repentance of the man of crime who had been placed beside Him no doubt to emphasise His guilt. We can safely follow Luke's order in making this "word" the second of those on the cross because the man's repentance most probably followed his association with the noisy Jewish demonstration that must have accompanied the completion of the initial work of crucifixion. The drastic effects of this crucifixion would have begun to take their toll of His strength quickly and perhaps this is reflected in the fact that Christ's horizon had narrowed from the world about Him to the victim on the bed of suffering beside Him. The third "word" from the cross appears to be the one which in John's account is closely associated with the disposal of Christ's garments namely the expression of Christ's thought for His mother. Probably as the Jewish reaction to the crucifixion spent itself the little group was able to edge its way to the foot of the cross. It would seem that before it was too late, while His former world and indeed His fellow sufferers were receding from His view, He spoke to those dear to Him at His "bedside." And His words to them—the last words that He really spoke to others were in their primary significance a domestic testament providing for His mother. If this narrowing of Christ's interest apparent in the first three "words" is indicative of a progressive physical deterioration it represents a scene all too familiar to us. This same visible approach of death is repeated daily in many an institution of suffering. And if John's remark "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus, His mother, and His mother's Sister, Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene" with its emphasis on "the cross of Jesus" can be taken to indicate that a little family group stood also beside the crosses of the other condemned, the scene becomes all the more familiar.

The words so far spoken were uttered with the needs of others in mind and they seem to fit into the very early part of the three hours on the cross. The words which follow however all

refer to Christ's own needs and they are the expressions of a man no longer of this world but on the very brink of death. These words of Christ faithfully recorded by the evangelists seem therefore to suggest that between the first "three" and the last "four" a long silence intervened—indeed an unbroken silence covering most of the period on the cross. If this is correct it would be the third great silence of the Passion. Christ was noticeably silent during the Trial before the Sanhedrin and this silence emphasised the Jewish nation's disregard for truth in a political dilemma. The second silence of the Passion spans and connects the Trial before Pilate emphasising an individual's disregard for truth in a personal dilemma. The third silence, the silence of the cross, must have given Calvary its tragic atmosphere, emphasising that a time comes when it is too late for nation or individual to take advantage of truth.

The first of the last "four words" was heard as Matthew and Mark note about the ninth hour which according to Luke was the hour of Christ's death. The prolonged silence seems to have been broken and the mysterious darkness disturbed by words of prayer that came to the lips of Christ in His last moments. The voice came as a shock to the bystanders some of whom missed what the dying man had said. But for those who did hear them they were the words of Psalm 21 "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me." Contact with those about had ceased for several hours but this aspiration indicates that it had been a time of extreme suffering. The dying lips, the unexpected aspiration—what a thoroughly human scene. Then it seems that the "fifth word" was spoken: "I thirst." At first sight it appears like Christ's last request upon this earth but coming as it does immediately after the previous prayer, as a piecing together of Matthew and John reveal, it is rather the spontaneous indication by Christ of the State of His throat and mouth which He felt as He tried to speak aloud after suffering so long in silence. Again a common place scene. Then Christ, like many another on his deathbed, opened His parched lips to the humble drink that is offered to the dying. And hence it was with moistened lips, as John must indicate, He uttered another aspiration: "It is consummated." Every man hopes to be able to say with His last breath "God's Will be done" but Christ could say "God's Will has been done." Christ had come to Jerusalem on His final journey that "all things shall be accomplished which were written by the prophets

concerning the Son of Man." There was no query in His mind as to what God's Will as regards His end might be. Day by day He had gone forward with the thought of certain and imminent death before Him and therefore He needed no one to whisper to Him the thought of the Divine Will. Even for Christ therefore His dying aspiration was a simple utterance of His attitude in life. Here we have an example that we cannot afford to miss. And now the hour of death had come. The last words to be heard from the dying lips was the immortal phrase "Into thy hands I commend my spirit." With all the strength that remained, perhaps with a show of unusual strength which often heralds death, Christ freely and obediently gave back His soul to God. The early obedience of the child of Nazareth to its parents, the respect of the man for the customs and laws of the land found its own level in the final and perfect obedience upon the cross.

As Christ died that phenomenon which is so common but so terrible in its finality occurred. Christ bowed His head in death. It is difficult to follow with certainty the sequence of events that ensued. Certainly Christ was dead, as John emphasises, and it seems to be the normal confusion that follows death that in a certain sense pervades the narrative. Christ had belonged to a family and therefore respectable arrangements were soon made for the removal of the body. Christ had been also a national figure and how the nation coped with the disturbances which affected the veil of the Temple and the tombs of the dead remain unknown to us. Although it can be dangerous to reduce the Gospel narrative overmuch, perhaps the words of the soldier of the crucifixion give the final human touch to a most human scene. With his commendation "Indeed, this was the Son of God," as given by Matthew, the centurion is like many another who expresses the truth only when it is too late.

Although St. Paul reminds us that the Son of God appeared in the outward form of a man, it is not always easy to picture Him in all the circumstances accompanying human events or to place all His words in their exact context. But on the cross Our Divine Lord comes very close to us in both action and word. The words spoken by Christ on the cross seem to form a little compendium of both word and action which presents to man a pattern for the unavoidable experience of death. If the modern critic of the New Testament feels confident that he can reassess the Resurrection and the Ascension narratives and re-evaluate

the sayings and settings of the whole life of Christ, he must surely halt before the very primary tradition transmitted in the words from the cross. The primitive Christian community could have done very little to embellish this precious relic of Calvary. If we had been there on that Friday of the crucifixion we may have stood only at a distance with those whom Luke calls "all His acquaintance, and the women that had followed Him from Galilee" and therefore We may have missed something of what happened at the cross. But through the words given precisely and without distracting variation by the evangelists we can even now stand at the very foot of the cross and observe Christ's physical condition and hear the last sentiments of His soul. These human reactions of Christ as death approaches give a gentle warmth to the prospect of death awaiting us all.

While death remains in the future and its physical aspect unknown to us we can only hope and pray that something of the charity of the first three "words" and a measure of the abandonment of the last four "words" may hallow our last hours on this earth no matter how they may terminate. It was the charity and the abandonment of Christ's life that was in evidence at His death. At death His charity was tested by an apparently continuous barrage of derision by word and gesture. There were the blasphemies of those who passed by and referred to His unfulfilled predictions; the sneers of the Sanhedrin who belittled His miracles; the jibes of His fellow sufferers who questioned His power; the remarks of the soldiers who mocked His Kingship; the taunts of unknown bystanders who distorted His dying words. The abandonment or detachment of His life was tested to the ultimate by the isolation of death by crucifixion which separated one not only from his family but from all self respecting men. If charity and abandonment are to be with us in death and in the proportion then needed they must be with us continually in life.

On Calvary the soldiers sat on guard, people stood looking and a multitude gathered and dispersed in fear. For them the work of crucifixion was over and must be forgotten. For us the work of crucifixion lives in its salvific effect and must be ever remembered as the standard for the charity and abandonment in our lives.

A. J. CARROLL.

Pius XII Seminary, Banyo, Queensland.

Notes

Samuel the son of Elqanah and Anna, of the tribe of Levi, is one of the great figures of the Old Testament. He was a gift of God to the people of Israel at a time when the foreign yoke of

the Philistines pressed heavy upon them. He was the last and the wisest of the 12 Judges raised up by God to keep the Theocratic Ideal alive in days when tribal disunion left the

chosen people an easy prey to foreign invasion. In the history of revelation he holds even a greater place than in the political life of his nation. This is saying a great deal, considering that Samuel was the man who introduced monarchy and anointed the King out of whose royal house the Messias was to come. It is, however, true, for prophetism was more important in the national religious life of the Hebrews than royalty, and Samuel is the first of a regular line of prophets, the creator of prophetic seminaries, and a man of God in the highest sense of the term, one who taught the people their true vocation, who prayed for them unceasingly, who worked for them unselfishly, led an exemplary life himself, stood in theocratic loyalty for law and justice and exemplified, as few men have exemplified it, absolute obedience to the will of God. As the beautiful days of Samuel's precocious childhood and boyhood are an example for seminarians, so his public life and his life as director of a prophetic school is a model for priests. He was not a priest himself, though he seems sometimes by divine commission to have offered sacrifice. It is rather as an ambassador of God that he should be regarded. He is, as St. Peter indicated in his discourse at the Beautiful Gate, the first of that goodly company of prophets which we honour as "prophetarum laudabilis numerus."

His birth is placed about the year 1120 B.C. and his birthplace was Ramathaim, otherwise called Rama. It is not the Rama of Benjamin where the mourning of Rachel for her children poetically sounds in our ears from the pages of Jeremias. Rama, meaning a height, was quite as frequent in Palestine as Mullagh of similar meaning in Ireland—Mullinahone, Mullinavat. The Rama of Samuel's birth is almost certainly the Arimathaea of the noble

decurion Joseph, and is identified by the best authorities with Rentis, a place in the old territory of Ephraim, some 12 miles N.N.E. of Lydda. Elqanah, Samuel's father, was a Levite by blood, and an Ephraimite by domicile.

Elqanah was a pious Levite and a good man. We have no evidence that he ever performed Levitical functions, but the yearly pilgrimage to the Tabernacle at Silo and the fulfilment of his vows he never omitted, although the journey from Ramathaim to Silo, if we may judge from the description of Saul's peregrinations in search of his father's asses, was a difficult one. We must not be surprised that Elqanah had two wives, for, in those days, many excellent people had more than that, even Gedeon who has secured a place in the Roman Martyrology. It was probably on account of the childlessness of his first wife, Anna, that Elqanah took a second, for he loved Anna, but she was barren. Anna was as good as her name, which means Grace; but Phenenna, whose name means Coral or Pearl, was not quite a gem of goodness. She gave her husband several children, we do not know how many—a goodly number it seems—but she was jealous of Anna and treated her very badly. The persecution of a woman by a woman seems to have been at its worst at the time of the annual pilgrimage to Silo. One year Phenenna's insulting language towards Anna was particularly outrageous. She threw in her face her childlessness, which was the worst epithet of good-for-nothingness that an Israelite woman could have laid upon her. No doubt the language was arrogant, for at the sacred banquet following the family sacrifice at Silo Phenenna had got portions according to the number of her children. But Elqanah had, according to the ritual, only one portion for Anna. Under the malicious and irritating insults of her rival, Anna cried and would not eat. Her husband tried to console her saying: "Anna, why should you cry, and why not take your food, and why are you sad? Am I not better for you than ten children?" She was inconsolable, but the God of all consolation, Who knows how to bring good out of evil, was not far away. Anna poured out the bitterness of her soul and her tears before "the Lord of armies." God is here, at the beginning of the Book of Samuel, first called by this name of omnipotent lordship over the battalions of Israel, over the angelic hosts, and over the array of the stars. Anna's prayer for a male child, whom she promised to consecrate as a Nazirite, was intense, so interiorly intense that

she spoke no words, a fact which surprised Heli the High Priest, who was sitting by the doorpost of the sanctuary. Seeing her lips moving, he thought she was drunk, and told her to go and sleep off her wine. On her offering a humble explanation, he blessed her and Anna went her way, no longer a sad woman. Within a year her prayer was answered in the birth of a son, whom she called Samuel, a name which she understood to mean: "Obtained by prayer from God."

Anna did not go to Silo again until the child was weaned at the age of three. Then, with special sacrifices, she presented him to Heli, as a consecrated gift to the Lord. Little Samuel, as the original Hebrew verb seems to say, ratified his mother's act by making an adoration.

It was in this day of the joy of her heart that Anna improvised the canticle which more than all other poems of the Old Testament is the model of the Blessed Virgin's Magnificat. Her joy is in the thought of God casting down the proud and exalting the humble. Here is a brief study of this Canticle which, I may mention, has also made its contribution to the Office of the Immaculate Heart of Mary:

*

*

*

We can distinguish three main parts in the Canticle. The theme is announced as a burst of joy in a prologue or exordium, consisting of two distichs. A remarkable Messianic conclusion, also of two distichs, forms an epilogue, in which the note of universalism blends with a powerful statement of God's might, accented, as it were, by the thunder claps which so often accompany divine theophanies. The body of the poem (vv. 2-10a) celebrates God's attributes, with special attention to that rule of His providence, which the Blessed Virgin also emphasised so much: He brings down the proud and lifts up the lowly.

This body of the poem admits a tripartite division: (1) a vision of God's uniqueness in wisdom, power and knowledge (2, 3) —(2) a vision of his aforesaid policy (4-8)—(3) a vision of his omnipotent government of the world (9, 10a).

PROLOGUE

My heart is exultant in the Lord;
my strength is triumphant in my
God.

My mouth is wide open against my
foes, for I am rejoicing in thy help.

This translation gives the sense conveyed by certain metaphors which belong to the Hebrew language, and sound peculiar to us. "Strength triumphant" is represented by the metaphor of "horn exalted;" and "the mouth opened wide" is a metaphor of outspoken confidence. This religious boasting, so fundamentally humble, is much more sweetly expressed in the opening verses of Mary's "Magnificat."

GOD'S
UNIQUENESS

There is none holy like the Lord,
(for really there is none but thee),
and there is no rock like our God.
Do not vaunt much in pride, in pride,
let not arrogance come from your
mouth,

For the Lord is a God of knowledge,
and by Him actions are weighed.

Before the God of holiness, the God of power, the God of knowledge, the pride of human arrogance is surely put out of court. The verse which we have bracketted is to be regarded as an ejaculatory gloss, as the change of person indicates. "Pride" or uppishness is given the emphasis of duplication. The title "God of knowledge" carries another sort of emphasis, namely, that of pluralisation, which St. Jerome kept in his well-known rendering: "*Deus scientiarum*." German scholars call this plural *Potenzierungsplural* or "the plural of potentiation." It is akin to what is often called the plural of majesty in such words as *Elohim*, *Adonim*.

GOD'S REVERSAL
POLICY

The bows of the strong ones are
broken, and the weak are girded
with strength,

Those that were full are earning their
bread, and those hungry need work
no more,

The barren woman gives birth seven
times, and the mother of many is
failing.

'Tis the Lord that kills and gives life,
brings down to the grave and
brings up.

The Lord makes the poor and the rich,
'tis He abases and elevates

From the dust He lifts up the needy
and the poor he raises from the
mire,

To seat them on high amongst princes,
and assign them a glorious throne.

This series of seven antitheses is laid under contribution by the author of Psalm 112 and by Our Lady in the Magnificat. There are no exegetical difficulties. Consequently the translation will suffice, unless it is deemed necessary to note that "seven times" means "many times."

GOD'S
GOVERNMENT
IN POWER

The pillars of the earth are the Lord's,
on them He has set the world.

The steps of His pious ones He guards,
while the wicked perish in
darkness.

Not in his own strength is man strong;
the Lord breaks those who fight
Him.

Needless to say, the pillars on which the earth rests belong to ancient Semitic cosmography and poetry. Psalm 74 and Job (9:6) speak of those pillars or columns also. The thought is that He who keeps the world on firm supports, supports the pious also. The friends of God are safe; His enemies are heading for destruction.

NEW AGE
AGE OF THE
MESSIAS

The Most High in Heaven shall
thunder, the Lord shall judge the
utmost ends.

He shall give power to His King and
lift up the head of His Christ.

Thunder is, at it were, the stroke of the gong announcing the divine advent. The combination of universalism and kingship shows that Anna had some illumination about the Messias. And this is the first mention of the King-Messias in the Bible.

W. LEONARD.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Book Reviews

MARY WARD, by Mary Oliver, I.B.V.M. Sheed and Ward, London, 1960. XX, 229 pages; 18/-.

Mary Ward, "That incomparable woman," to use the words of Pius XII, was born in 1585, dying after a most extraordinary life in 1645. She was daughter of a Yorkshire Catholic gentleman, who suffered much for the Faith, generously supporting the priests who made their way to England in spite of the laws of Elizabethan England. From an early age, according to the customs of the times, her hand was sought in marriage, but the deeply religious girl refused all such offers. At Babthorpe she met the Jesuits, Father John Gerard and Father Holtby, who were to remain her friends and advisers during the tormented years to follow. The accession of James I to the throne following upon the death of Queen Elizabeth aroused the hopes of the Catholics, but the penal laws remained in force, all the more so after the Gunpowder Plot. Mary Ward desiring to become a nun left England in 1606 for St. Omer, a rallying place for the English Catholics in exile. Directed (in the full sense of the word) by the Jesuit, Father George Keynes, Mary Ward found herself the lay sister for a convent of Poor Clares in the town. She desiring a life of meditation was busy from morning until evening, begging food for the community. All her previous desires had been to enter religion for her own salvation and for the salvation of the Faith in England. Although Father Keynes exuded cheerful optimism, Mary Ward made up her mind to leave.

Curiously she had in mind the idea of a foundation of a convent of Poor Clares for Englishwomen. The Bishop approved; the Jesuits had had such a plan in view; all that was required was the permission of the Archduke Albert (not Charles (page 58)) and his wife the Infanta Isabella at Brussels. The convent was opened at Gravelines, directed not by Franciscans, but by an English Jesuit. Mother Oliver points out (page 60) that the convent of Poor Clares in Sydney stems from Mary Ward's idea. However "a sudden divine light showed her," Mother Oliver writes, "that she was not to be of the Order of St. Clare." Returning to England, she practised what may be termed the lay apostolate, yet her ambition to serve Christ was not satisfied. Returning to Flanders "she heard distinctly, not by sound of voice, but intellectually understood, these words: 'Take the same (name?) of the Society'." Mary Ward did not at once make known the end of the message: "Father General will never permit it, go to him." There was indeed some alarm at the thought of "Jesuitesses," among the Jesuits in the first place. Mary Ward wished to found a teaching order based on the Rule of St.

Ignatius, subject to a Mother General and without enclosure. Her plan was novel in those times. Many interests were hostile: the bishops, the Jesuits, the English secular priests, the Roman authorities. Before she knew it the English Ladies were in the centre of the conflict in England: as Mother Oliver puts it with delicacy: "The chief difference of opinion was on the subject of the restoration of the hierarchy in England; the unfortunate secular priests feeling the need of bishops, the Jesuits feeling that the times were not yet propitious for such a move." The institute of the English Ladies, or the Loreto nuns (from Mary Ward's great devotion to the Holy House) flourished in Germany and Italy, but lacked papal approval under Gregory XV and Urban VIII. Mary Ward was inflexible concerning the question of the enclosure. As so often happens, the tension produced disunion among the nuns and some were led to spread stories about Mary Ward's extravagance and love of finery. The final blow came in January, 1631, with the suppression of the institute; Mary Ward was at Munich where she was imprisoned "as a heretic, schismatic, and rebel to the Holy Church." The former nuns gathered around Mary Ward, when she was released, and though living in the world in secular dress, they retained the cadres which were in life in 1703 when Clement XI granted approval to Mary Ward's work with the phrase: "Let women be ruled by women." Mary Ward herself died in Yorkshire, being buried at Osbaldwick in 1645. Her body has been removed "but whether by friend or foe no one knows."

Such is the bare summary of the most interesting story that Mother Oliver has to tell. It is a woman's world—the story of a saintly woman by a woman (not to mention Maisie Ward's prologue and epilogue which sandwich Mother Oliver's work), so it would be rash for males to enter the field. Mother Oliver has embellished the facts (and all know what long years went into the writing of the book) with graceful imaginary, conjectural details of the feelings and conversations of the characters. Whether it was wise or not we must leave to women's judgment. The lack of an index and a fuller list of earlier books are a disappointment, but for that we accuse Maisie Ward who occupies at least twenty-seven pages of a fairly small book; indeed after Maisie Ward kicked off and got the ball, Mother Oliver did well to win a scrum and score winning points.

Mother Oliver in distant Australia could not hope to write a definitive life, nor did she intend to do so. She has written a beautiful essay based on wide and varied reading that will interest many in "that incomparable woman, Mary Ward."

T.V.

PATROLOGY, by J. Quasten. Vol. III. Spectrum, Utrecht and Antwerp. The Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland, 1960. XXV + 605 pages.

In this new volume Professor Quasten treats of the Greek Patristic literature from the Council of Nice (325) to the Council of Chalcedon (451). Professor Quasten's work on the golden age of Greek patristic literature has been long awaited and it will receive a very enthusiastic welcome. When the German scholar, who is the professor of ancient Church history and Christian archaeology in the Catholic University of America, began his Patrology some years back, the venture appeared most hazardous. The solid learning with the extensive quotations from the Fathers and the detailed examination of the theological importance of the writings in question quickly dispelled all apprehension. Quasten's *Patrology* has become widely known and appreciated not only in Catholic circles but also among non-Catholic scholars who were quick to appreciate the learning shown in the book. Already the first two volumes have been translated into French and published by *Les Éditions du Cerf*. While Professor Quasten has designed his work as a text book, he has taken pains also in his up-to-the-minute bibliographies to provide a precious guide for the research student. The theologian and the historian also will find much valuable information in Quasten's *Patrology*.

With Constantine's victory at the Milvian Bridge, Christian writers were no longer on the defensive against pagan attacks, so now they could devote themselves to the development of ecclesiastical science. In this vale of tears the first feelings of glorious relief were darkened by the false teaching of Arius and his school, to be followed by Apollinaris, Nestorius, Eutyches. Yet the errors forced the writers of the fourth century to meditate profoundly on the great theological questions with a freshness of outlook, apart from other things, which was never to be equalled.

The writers of Alexandria and Egypt occupy the first section (St. Athanasius has some eighty pages); then follow the founders of Egyptian monasticism, the writers of Asia Minor (the Cappadocian Fathers, Basil, Gregory and Gregory of Nyssa run into nearly a hundred pages) and the writers of Antioch and Syria. The index, both particular and general, is generous in space, giving the reader an easy way to consult the work.

Professor Quasten's method is well known from earlier volumes in his series. Each writer's life is well sketched with an abundant book list; the authentic works are described, illustrated by quotations, the editions, translations and studies devoted to the particular work are given; the theological teaching of the writer in question is described.

Professor Quasten has proved himself to be a sound scholar

and an admirable guide to the Christian literature of the past. A further volume will deal with the giants of the West, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Leo the Great and their contemporaries. It will be awaited with impatience.

T.V.

* * * * *

PARENTS' ROLE IN VOCATIONS, by Godfrey Poage, C.P., and John P. Treacy, Ph.D. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1959. VII + 132 pages; price 30/6.

Father Poage has already written "Recruiting for Christ" and "For More Vocations."

The authors begin by pointing out the need for proper parental control in general. The book then proceeds to treat with the manner in which parents should influence their children. Each chapter deals with how this influence can be exercised on the child at a particular age, e.g., teenagers. The next step is how to choose a vocation. This is followed by a chapter on particular problems of parents and concludes with a well-laid out questionnaire so that the parents can determine whether they are a success or not.

The title adequately expresses the content of the book. The book gives simple instructions to parents on how they can influence their children's choice of vocation. It is written specifically about religious vocations but the authors say that the principles involved could be applied to any vocation. Their plan is very good and it follows a logical sequence.

The style is simple and very entertaining. The examples used are very practical ones and help towards the clarity of expression.

Rather than draw a conclusion of their own, Father Poage and Dr. Treacy have given a self evaluation quiz so that the reader will be able to draw his own conclusion and to see where his faults lie.

It is pleasing to note that they have included an index, so that those who require only the matter concerning the upbringing of, e.g., pre-school children, can quickly see where to obtain their information.

J.F.T.

* * *

LIVING THE MASS, by F. Desplanques, S.J.; translated by Sister Maria Constance; Sands, London, 1959; 12/6 stg.

Father Desplanques' study on the Mass deserves a high place on the list of recent devotional studies. Inspired by the needs of the Lay Apostolate for a closer union of priest and laity in the central act of Christian worship, he has presented us with a work whose central theme is the priesthood of the laity. His aim is clearly described in his sub-title, "The Ordinary of the Mass and . . . The Ordinary of Life," for the self oblation of

both priest and laity must pervade every aspect of daily life. "It is indeed the complete Christian who will present himself to the complete Christ, the Christ of the Consecration, jealous of the glory of His Father, Who gathers into Himself all creation . . . and draws it into the fire of sacrifice."

The author's style is vivid and forceful, for his book takes the form of pithy prayerful reflections which are meant more for meditation than for continuous reading. A well-spaced layout and a good English translation combine to make this work an attractive and valuable contribution to the liturgical apostolate.

G.P.I.

* * * * *

THE SPIRIT OF CATHOLICISM, by Karl Adam, in series New Ark Library; Sheed and Ward, London, 1959; 6/- stg.

Sheed and Ward have done us a great service by reprinting in a paper back series some of their finest works. To start the series they have made an admirable choice in Karl Adam's famous study of the Church, "The Spirit of Catholicism." Although it was first published in 1928 and the intervening years have seen many volumes on the same subject, Karl Adam can claim the credit of being a pioneer in a field of theology that has made great progress in this century. But his work is not of historical interest alone. His insight into the grandeur of the Church and the meaning of her mission remains today penetrating and relevant, as does his insistence on the work of the Holy Spirit Who moves behind the visible structure to give freshness and vigour to the Body of Christ. He is not afraid to present a complete picture of the Church both in its ideals and in its reality. This clear presentation of the Catholic theology of the Church is particularly welcome at the present time for it can contribute to the dialogue between Catholics and non-Catholics in their efforts for Christian unity.

G.P.I.

* * * * *

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE ART OF LIVING, by J. A. O'Driscoll, London, 1959. B. Herder, London. Octavo, 127pp. 9/6 stg. Cloth bound.

Do we realise living is an art? Every man is an artist. The Divine spark that distinguishes the great artist from the mediocre in this art form is the Holy Ghost. Each of His seven gifts work through one of the three theological and four moral virtues to produce one of the eight beatitudes.

"If we look at brightly coloured objects in brilliant sunshine and then close our eyes and look into dark corners, the colours and shapes remain before our vision." Such is wisdom, spiritual discernment by which we see God in all creatures.

The reason why the early fathers penetrated so deeply the primitive truths of early Christian theology was because of

their possession of the gift of understanding to give penetration to the gifts believed by Faith.

Knowledge, spiritual instinct, is a gift different from wisdom and counsel. We learn from it how to winnow the wheat of life from the chaff, and apply principles correctly.

Counsel takes over where prudence leaves off. It combines with prudence to help self and others: "Blessed are the merciful."

Piety teaches us to enjoy our religion, just as many people enjoy hard work in the guise of sport. It regulates our attitude to God, our Father; to those joined to us by ties of blood; to our fatherland; to our fellow members of the communion of saints; especially the blessed in heaven; Our Lady, and Jesus Christ.

Fortitude regulates and perfects bravery. It effects success by inspiring confidence, patience and perseverance, even in the little trials of life; yet protects us from ambition and presumption.

Fear of the Lord must be distinguished from servile or worldly fear, which, according to St. John, is incompatible with charity. It expels wrong fear such as that underlying scrupulosity and despair. The Holy Ghost brings about in us the correct temper of fear.

This little book is remarkable not by its length but by its lucidity. References are put in an appendix at the back which leaves pages clear, and allows free scope for the enthusiast to look up the thirty-eight references to the *Summa*, the frequent Old and New Testament quotations and St. Francis de Sales. The doctrine is that of St. Thomas, which is the basis of Leo XIII's encyclical on the Holy Ghost. It is a practical little book for it applies each gift to daily life.

E.J.K.

*

*

*

*

*

PRAY LIKE THIS, by Leonard Sheil, S.J. Dublin, M. H. Gill and Son Ltd., 1959, ix + 137pp. price, 3/-.

Here in this paper-back is an answer to the perennial question, "Lord, teach us to pray?" It is an answer which could be bettered only by our Lord himself. When the disciples asked their master to teach them how to pray they were given a prayer which was more than the sentiment or longing of a merely human heart, they received an effective and truly worthy instrument, for it was a prayer originating in the God-Man, God Himself. In each of the sixty-eight meditations in this collection Father Sheil introduces the reader to a text of the Gospels. His helpful commentary on the passages aids the reader in a reconstruction of the situation described, with homely examples it applies the event to the life of the reader, and finally suggests a fitting prayer. We could not wish for a more perfect selection of meditations, for it has as its basis the inspired word of God. For this reason the collection is suitable for all, regardless of any previous contact with mental prayer.

In conclusion Father Sheil offers a series of extracts from the Gospels and the Psalms as vocal prayers. These, like all prayers of similar origin, have a value far beyond that of any others. Prayer is the raising of the mind to God, there can be no better instrument in its practice than the very word of God.

M.B.

*

*

*

THE COMPLETE PRAYERS OF HIS HOLINESS PIUS XII.

Translated from the original texts by Alastair Guinan.
Belgium: Desclee, 1959. 176 pages. Ill. Price, 1.50 dollars.

This book is a list of 91 prayers written by Pope Pius XII. Each has been dedicated either to Our Lady or Our Lord under a particular title; or to a particular group in the world for recitation, e.g., Prayer for a Christian Family, Prayer for Prisoners.

The translator has collected these prayers and put them into book form for the English reader. The original texts were, on the whole, written in Italian. They were either prayers actually composed by Pius XII or extracts from sermons he gave. They have been put together in chronological order. They extend over the period from when Pius XII was consecrated a Cardinal until his death.

The book contains a full index and also notes which state from what original text each prayer was taken.

The use of the term "complete" in the title is rather misleading. I do not think that this small book could possibly contain *all* of his prayers. The translator has seen fit to include extracts only from *some* of his sermons and so the word "complete" could be deleted from the title.

The prayers, as written, are obviously the work of a very pious man. Their content is to be highly commended. However, being a book of prayers it is not such that the reader could read in one sitting. Each prayer should be read slowly and well at a suitable time. They are worded simply and could even be used by children.

The illustrations are excellent. One in particular deserves special comment. It is a full length colour photograph of the late Pope kneeling at his prie-dieu with his hands joined in prayer.

J.F.T.